

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of the Liberal Arts

**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN INDIA:
IDENTIFYING TYPES OF CONTROL AND COPING MECHANISMS
IN VIOLENT RELATIONSHIPS**

A Dissertation in

Sociology and Demography

by

Niveditha Menon

© 2008 Niveditha Menon

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2008

The dissertation of Niveditha Menon was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Michael P. Johnson
Associate Professor (Emeritus) of Sociology, Women's Studies, and African
and African American Studies
Dissertation Co-Advisor
Co-Chair of Committee

R.S. Oropesa
Professor of Sociology and Demography
Dissertation Co-Advisor
Co-Chair of Committee

Nancy Landale
Director, Population Research Institute and Professor of Sociology and
Demography

Carolyn Sachs
Head of Women's Studies and Professor of Women's Studies and Rural
Sociology

John McCarthy
Professor of Sociology
Head of the Department of Sociology

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

In an effort to bring clarity to the varieties of domestic violence across contexts, this study examines specifically the relationship among patriarchy, domestic violence and agency exerted by women. Although patriarchy has been largely investigated as the primary cause of domestic violence, the processes that mark this relationships has rarely been assessed. In addition, patriarchal ideology and restrictions in the Indian family system are uniformly blamed as the primary reason for women staying in violent relationships (Johnson & Johnson 2001). Recently, researchers have questioned whether patriarchy is the only factor affecting domestic violence, and whether women are always hapless victims of violence (Johnson 1995, Sangari, 2002). I argue based on these findings there is a need for the reassessment of the relationship patriarchal ideology, agency and domestic violence.

Paying close attention to the specific interpersonal and intra-familial dynamics of control and coping mechanisms in a marital relationship, this project answers four main research questions: (1) What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence? (2) How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives? (3) What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts? and (4) How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?

To answer these questions, I employ a blended methodology of qualitative and quantitative research to identify different types of control contexts in familial violence and the differential effects of these types of domestic violence. I use a combination of primary and secondary data. The secondary data for the project comes from the Demographic Health Survey of India, conducted in 1999. This large-scale survey data are used in conjunction with primary data to create a unique dataset that enabled me to better understand the micro- and macro-structures of domestic violence in India. Thus, by conducting this research, I want to make a case for the importance of making distinctions in domestic violence and to explicate some of the contributions that such distinctions can make to our understanding of domestic violence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	ix
Advice to orators.....	1
Chapter 1 INTRODUCTION.....	2
PATRIARCHY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND COPING	2
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	5
METHODOLGY	5
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	6
CHAPTER OVERVIEW	7
The new wife	10
Chapter 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
An (un)common story.....	11
DEFINITIONS.....	12
Domestic violence	12
Patriarchal ideology and structure.....	14
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PATRIARCHAL IDEOLOGY	15
Indian family systems.....	16
Different types of domestic violence.....	18
Domestic violence research in India.....	23
COPING MECHANISMS.....	27
Conceptualizing agency and coping.....	28
AGENCY AND COPING	30
Coping research in India.....	33
DISSERTATION QUESTIONS.....	38
DESCRIPTION OF STUDY	39
HYPOTHESES	41
Types of violence and coping mechanisms.	41
Regional differences	42
Family Characteristics	43
Individual Characteristics	45
Women	47
Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY.....	48
INTRODUCTION	48
SECONDARY DATA SOURCE: DHS INDIA.....	50
Sample Design.....	51
Questionnaires.....	52

Measurement of quantitative data: DHS India.....	53
Dependent Variable : Husband violence	53
Independent Variables	53
Family characteristics	54
Personal Characteristics.....	57
PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION: PUNE FIELDWORK	60
CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCATION	61
Maharashtra	61
Pune.....	62
Pimpri-Chinchwad.....	62
SAMPLE DESIGN: PUNE FIELDWORK.....	63
SAMPLE SELECTION.....	65
QUANTITATIVE SURVEYS AND QUALITATIVE SURVEYS IN PUNE.....	65
PROCESS OF PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION	69
Insignia of Blood.....	71
Chapter 4 DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND CONTROL IN INDIA Using quantitative analyses from secondary and primary data.....	72
DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE USED IN THE STUDY	72
DHS India.....	72
STRUCTURAL CONTEXT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	77
Predicting violence based on regional differences.....	77
Predicting violence based on family characteristics.....	78
Predicting violence on individual characteristics	83
Summary of DHS India analyses:.....	85
DESCRIPTION OF FIELDWORK IN PUNE	87
DIVERSITY OF CONTROL CONTEXTS	90
CONTROL CONTEXTS AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	92
CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTROL CONTEXTS IN VIOLENT RELATIONSHIPS	94
Types of violence and sample variation	95
Types of violence and family characteristics	96
Types of violence and individual characteristics	98
Additional characteristics	101
Summary of Fieldwork analyses:.....	104
A voiced.....	107
Chapter 5 THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF CONTROL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: Examining narratives of domestic violence.....	108
ECONOMIC ABUSE.....	109
MALE PRIVILEGE.....	113
CHILDREN.....	116
ISOLATION.....	120

MINIMIZING, BLAMING, AND DENYING.....	122
INTIMIDATION and COERCION AND THREATS	125
USE OF ALCOHOL.....	127
Situational couple violence and alcohol	129
Intimate terrorism and alcohol.....	130
CONTROL TACTICS SPECIFIC TO INDIAN CONTEXT'	131
FAMILY CONTEXT: FAMILY STRUCTURE.....	132
Family structure and arguments	132
Family instigated violence	134
Family support	137
MARITAL CONTEXT	139
Marital happiness	139
Marital communication	141
FAMILY AND MARITAL SOCIAL ROLE.....	142
SUMMARY OF RESULTS	147
Suicided.....	150
Chapter 6 THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF AGENCY AND COPING	
MECHANISMS Examining narratives of coping mechanisms.....	151
COPING MECHANISMS AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	151
Progression of coping documented in the United States	151
Coping in the Indian context.....	152
CHARACTERISTICS OF COPING IN QUANTITATIVE SURVEYS	154
TYPES OF COPING.....	154
COPING AND TYPES OF VIOLENCE.....	157
Husband's reactions to the violence.....	159
CHARACTERISTICS OF COPING MECHANISMS IN NARRATIVES	161
Help seeking behaviors.....	161
Conciliatory behaviors	163
Negotiating behaviors.....	166
Independent behaviors	167
Resistance behaviors	169
Leaving behaviors.....	171
CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES ON COPING	172
STRUCTURAL CONTEXT.....	172
Urban and rural environment.....	172
Formal networks (police and women's groups).....	175
Informal social networks: friends and neighbors.....	180
FAMILY CONTEXT.....	182
Family structure	182
Family support (natal or marital).....	186
Presence of children.....	188
MARITAL CONTEXT	189
Arrangement of marriage	189
Marital expectations	192

Marital communication and arguments.....	195
COPING EFFICACY AND RESTRICTIONS.....	197
Monetary considerations	197
Familial considerations	200
Emotional considerations	202
SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	206
Utterance	208
Chapter 7 THE INTERACTIVE NATURE OF CONTROL, VIOLENCE, AND AGENCY Examining three case studies	209
CASE STUDY: SITUATIONAL COUPLE VIOLENCE.....	209
Description of Hasini.....	209
Violence experienced by Hasini	211
CASE STUDY: ALCOHOL-RELATED VIOLENCE.....	213
Description of Vinaya.....	213
Violence experienced by Vinaya.....	214
CASE STUDY: INTIMATE TERRORISM	215
Description of Dhriti	215
Violence experienced by Dhriti.....	216
INTERACTIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTROL AND VIOLENCE.....	218
Progression and characteristics of violence	219
Specific control tactics	222
Family characteristics	225
Marital characteristics.....	227
Coping mechanisms	229
Summary	235
The Philosophers: Lao-Tzu	237
Chapter 8 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	238
SUMMARY OF RESULTS.....	238
(1) What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence?.....	239
(2) How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives?	240
(3) What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts?.....	243
(4) How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?	243
CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESEARCH.....	245
Patriarchal control and domestic violence.....	245
Women's agency and domestic violence.....	246
Cross-cultural studies	247

LIMITATIONS	248
RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH	251
Relevance to theory	251
Relevance to research.....	253
Relevance to activists	253
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	254
Theory	254
Research.....	256
Activists.....	258
CONCLUSIONS	264
Mulligatawny Dreams	266
BIBLIOGRAPHY	267
Appendix A First Interview.....	286
Appendix B Second Interview	302

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Description of Datasets.....	49
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics: Demographic and family variables	73
Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics: Decision-making in the household.....	74
Table 3.2 Descriptive Statistics: Decision-making in the household (cont.).....	75
Table 3.3 Descriptive Statistics: Education, employment, and attitudnal characteristics.....	76
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics:Domestic/Family violence.....	76
Table 5: Logistic regressions predicting domestic violence	80
Table 6: Descriptive Statistics:Marital characteristics	88
Table 7: Anova Table: Johnson's typology with control items.....	93
Table 8: Cross tabulations of violence with Johnson's typology.....	94
Table 9: Cross tabulations of family characteristics with Johnson's typology	96
Table 10: Cross tabulations of decision-making with Johnson's typology.....	99
Table 11: Cross tabulations of individual characteristics with Johnson's typology.....	100
Table 12: Cross tabulations of use of alcohol with Johnson's typology.....	102
Table 13: Descriptive statistics: Coping straegies	103
Table 14:Cross tabulations of Johnson's typology with coping strategies	104
Table 15: Different types of control tactics.....	109
Table 16: Types of Coping Behaviors (Goodman et.al, 2003): US Context.....	155
Table 17: Descriptive statistics: Coping mechanisms	155
Table 18: Coping behaviors by types of violence	159
Table 19: Husband’s response to violence by types of violence	160
Table 20: Types of Coping Behaviors – Indian context.....	161

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one could have written my dissertation for me (despite my fervent wish that someone would). At the same time, this rather lengthy page seems inadequate to express the gratitude that I feel towards the individuals who helped me to get to this page.

It probably comes as no surprise to anyone who knows him, but it bears repeating: Dr. Michael P. Johnson is one of the best advisors anyone can ever have. Aside from being a wonderfully astute advisor who gently prodded me to finish my dissertation, the way he lives his life has been my inspiration. I can only hope to follow in his footsteps in dealing with life's many problems with grace, dignity, and above all, a marvelous sense of humor. Another person that I would like to thank for his superb sense of humor and unfailing enthusiasm for my project is my co-chair, Dr. Sal Oropesa. Sal challenged me to critically examine my dissertation in a much broader light and helped to crystalize and organize my thoughts throughout the dissertation process. The readability of this dissertation owes much to his organizational efforts. Together, my two co-chairs were the backbone of this dissertation. I want to thank them for making the whole process of research and writing extremely fulfilling and above all, fun.

My two committee members, Dr. Nancy Landale and Dr. Carolyn Sachs, were also critical to the completion of this project. Dr. Landale's many insights into the methodologies and results of this research helped me to guide my thoughts to the overarching utility of this project, pushing me to rethink and reexamine the tenets of my arguments. Dr. Carolyn Sachs, apart from giving me a second home in Women's Studies, guided me to create a more feminist space within my writing, and helped me to identify traps of singular modes of thinking. All in all, it was a truly humbling and beneficial exercise to listen and to learn from my committee members and I thank them for showing me the roadmaps of good scholarship.

I would like to thank my home department of Sociology and Demography for the institutional, educational, and financial support that they provided for all my years in Penn State. More directly, I would like to thank Dr. Farkas for his efforts for securing the financial resources necessary for me to conduct my field research. I would also like to thank Dr. John Kramer for his tireless efforts at ensuring that I was fully funded during my stay at Penn State. He was able to conjure a working schedule so that I could teach and write this dissertation without compromising the integrity of both my pursuits. I would also like to thank Dr. John McCarthy who has always been extremely supportive and encouraging of my projects in his capacity as the Graduate Advisor as well as the Head of the department.

I would also like to thank the administrative staff on the 2nd floor of Oswald Tower, especially Marcy McAfee and Jennifer Shultz, for their help in dealing with the vagaries of graduate school. In addition, Sondra Morrison and Melody Lane, dealt with each of my oversights and mistakes with unending patience and admirable serenity. I would also like to thank the administrative and support staff on the 8th floor of Oswald Tower for creating a comfortable atmosphere to work in. The following individuals never hesitated to answer my many questions and solve my numerous problems: Don Miller, Steve Maczuga, Matt Masullo, Jason Pruszko, Kiet Bang, Michael Rineer and Benjamin Karhan. Above all, I would like to thank the 8th floor lab for the 8th floor printer, without which I could not have hoped to function as a scholar.

The dissertation was also made possible by grants from the Penn State Research Graduate Studies Office (RGSO) and the Crawford Family Fellowship for Ethical Inquiry. I personally would like to thank Mr. Forrest Crawford for his support for ethical inquiry, without which I would not have been able to articulate in my dissertation and other research papers, the importance of ethics in our scholastic pursuits. I would also like to thank the Rock Ethics Institute for giving me an analytical space to consider the cross-disciplinary implications of my work.

Many thanks to Dr. Shirisha Sathe, Hemalata Honwad, and Chitra Khare for helping me conduct my dissertation work. Dr. Shirisha Sathe was instrumental in providing me critical understanding of the realities of field work and I benefited greatly from her insight, her can-do attitude, and her extensive knowledge of domestic violence. Much thanks to Hemalata Honwad for providing me excellent company for the duration of my stay in Pune and for taking up the monumental task of translating my interviews. I thank her profoundly for her enthusiasm for my project. No one deserves more praise and thanks than Chitra Khare. Not only was she my translator and transcriber through almost every interview, she also became a good friend. Her good sense, positive attitude, and quick wit got me through the roughest part of collecting data. This dissertation and I owe much to her. I would also express my gratitude to the heads of the two organizations, Medha Thate and Nandini Datar, for their extensive co-operation over the course of the data collection. They went out of their way to ensure that my research goals were met. I would also like to thank all the caseworkers especially Maya Tai, Varsha Tai, Vaishali Tai, and Ganesh Bau for ensuring that I always had respondents to interview whenever I visited. Without the cooperation of these excellent individuals, my dissertation research would not have been possible.

I want to thank the members of my cohort for sharing their lives with me. I would not have made it through the collective friendship of Ed, Latrica, Mindy, Bina, Jake, and Amy. In particular, I would like to thank Ed Walker and Latrica Best. Ed Walker was a friend, philosopher and guide through many a rough patch. His keen intellect and sharp sense of humor were a constant comfort through the dissertation process and beyond. Latrica Best was my knight in shining armor in more ways than one. She was (sometimes simultaneously) a shoulder to cry on, a sounding board for research ideas, an ally to complain to, and a friend to laugh with.

I would also like to thank Sushmita Chatterjee and Alexa Schriempf for opening up my intellectual horizons. Apart from sharing the writing space with me, their collective wisdom helped me to articulate abstract concepts in my head into tangible matter. I would also like to thank Mira Hidajat, Fiona Barwick, Rasika Kalmegham, Jim Coker, Selvaraj, Tanya Kenkre, Dee May, Swathi and Nagesh Prabhu, and Xiaomin, for their wonderful hospitality and friendship throughout the dissertation process. Each of them, at some point or another, provided me with excellent food, company, and physical space so that I could de-toxify from the intensity of writing the dissertation.

Special thanks to D'Andre Wilson for helping me create a mental and emotional space within myself so that I could write this dissertation and live my life with honesty. I also want to thank the entire team at Websters Café for providing a physical space to write in and to live in. Their teas and meals were important sources of intellectual nourishment. I also am grateful to the entire musical team of the soundtrack of Jaane Tu

for providing the background music so that I could crank out the final versions of this dissertation.

I want to thank the members of the co-op for being insane enough to give me space (of all kinds) for a year, and continuing to be insane in wonderfully wacky, creative, and loving ways. All of you filled my life with food, music, laughter, art, drama, and love - I have never been happier anywhere else than my final year with all of you (in alphabetical order): Anne, Chelius, Chris, Dubs, Elisabet, Eric, Gerrett, Gen, Jordan, the Joshes, Jimmy, Lisa, Meghan, Parker, Rachel, Tyler, and Zach. Knowing all of you have enriched me and in turn, this dissertation immensely.

I would like to thank my family members for their supportive and encouraging words over the years. I would like to thank my aunt, my uncle, and my two cousins for their confidence in me. I particularly want to thank Mimmi for her encouraging phone calls, and to Kavya for her comforting company in New York city. I would like to thank Marie-Helene and Yvon for their words of encouragement, five course meals, and their uncanny ability to attract dolphins. I would also like to thank Mathieu for always being sympathetic and empathetic to my troubles in graduate school. Our conversations always boosted my spirits and it is a pleasure to have a kindred spirit as my brother.

Srijana Shrestha, my soul mate and best friend, deserves more thanks than any words can ever express. Not only has she been the rock in my life for the past decade, she has been my companion in graduate school, mirroring and validating my experiences while I was conceptualizing, collecting, and writing this dissertation. I thank her for the lazy afternoons, the endless discussions, the crappy Chinese food, and for her remarkable skill of always comprehending what I cannot name.

My final familial thanks, of course, are to my parents and to my sister. I would like to first thank my father for his dreams. Without them, I would not have attempted to go on this journey. Like all good story tellers, he made his dreams appealing enough that I wanted to make it my own. I want to thank my mother for her strength and for her faith and trust in me. During the hardest part of this journey, I tethered myself to her voice of hope and courage. From her, I have learned the power and potency of will. My sister was one of the few individuals who not only read the disastrous early drafts of my dissertation, but also managed to make sense of it. She became my editor, my sounding board, my friend, my barometer, and my cheerleader during graduate school and the dissertation process. I thank her for all these and other roles that she adopted while being my sister. Lastly, I would like to thank my family for the gift of laughter. My bellyful of laughter helped to clear all the obstacles that I found during the writing process.

Finally, I would like to thank the respondents who participated in my study. I cannot name any of you, but with your willingness to share pieces of yourself and your lives, you were able to inform and enrich my life and hopefully, the knowledge of domestic violence in the world. Your courage, your laughter, and your willingness to live life despite tremendous odds have been an inspiration to me. I thank you for the lessons that you taught me on humility, bravery, and sheer grit. This dissertation owes its heart to you.

To my parents and sister
who never stopped
believing and asking
“How goes the PacHaDi?”
a million times, thank you.

Advice to orators

In speech it's best – though not the only way –

Indeed the best, it's true, can be the worst –

Though often I...as I had meant to say:

Qualify later, state the premise first.

Vikram Seth

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence is often considered a universal phenomenon that affects women all over the world and is linked to the patriarchal control of women. While the spirit of this claim is acknowledged by many researchers and social activists (Abraham 2002, Dobash & Dobash 1979), its specific implications are usually unaddressed. What is the relationship of domestic violence to patriarchal structure? Is it the same in every context? Do the dynamics of power and control always play a part in domestic violence? The answers to these questions do not come easy. Activists and researchers alike have a stake in universalizing the horror of domestic violence. At the same time, they are also invested in representing the experience of different women accurately. The dynamics of relationship violence, thus, must be considered across various contexts, and the implications of the differences and the similarities of violent experiences must also be laid out clearly.

PATRIARCHY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND COPING

In an effort to bring clarity to the varieties of domestic violence across contexts, this study examines specifically the relationship between violence and patriarchy in the home. It has often been assumed that patriarchal structure is largely responsible for the high rates of domestic violence in any society (Bloch & Rao 1997, Johnson & Johnson 2001). In 1995, one of the prominent paradigm shifts in research about family violence came with the assertion that there are multiple forms of family violence, some more rooted in patriarchal structure than others (Johnson 1995). These forms of violence can be differentiated based on the control contexts in which these acts of violence are embedded (Johnson 1995). These different forms of violence are:

(1) Intimate Terrorism: This form of violence is characterized by one partner attempting to exert generalized control over the other partner. Data show that in heterosexual relationships, the majority of individuals perpetrating this type of violence are men and this forms of violence tends to show up in agency samples.

(2) Violent Resistance: This form of violence is used by individuals reacting to the coercive control attempts by their intimate terrorist partner. In most cases, this form of violence is used by women against their male partners.

(3) Situational Couple Violence: Neither of the partners is exerting generalized control, and the violence in the family is connected to specific situations, although there might be control involved with specific situations.

Research in the U.S. and U.K. on this framework indicates that this claim is substantiated across different populations and contexts (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Johnson 2001, Leone et al. 2001). In addition, my quantitative research on domestic violence in India found strong indications that violence in the home was less likely in strong patriarchal family settings than in less patriarchal settings (Menon, 2003). I found strong evidence that when power is concentrated along patriarchal lines, the likelihood of using violence is **reduced** because the structure of the family effectively imposes cultural, social, and physical restrictions on women. Thus, my previous research suggests: (1) patriarchy does not necessarily lead to the use of violence, and (2) violence may be used primarily as a means of last resort, after all other control tactics have failed.

Another reason for investigating the relationship between domestic violence and patriarchy in India is to debunk the circular argument that is often employed to explain this relationship. For example, it is said that India is a patriarchal society because it has high rates of domestic violence, and that there are high rates of domestic violence in India because it is

a patriarchal society. The relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence is simply assumed without investigating the processes that mark the relationship. I argue based on these findings as well as research on Johnson's typology that there is a need for the reassessment of the relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence.

However, there is a central limitation of the typology. It focuses exclusively on the husband-wife dyad in the nuclear family. In many countries, like India, a typical family consists of a hierarchical family structure with the oldest male in the top of the hierarchy and the youngest female is at the bottom of the hierarchy. This type of family derives its power and authority from a patriarchal structure that advantages men over women. So, the role of women's actions acting against or with violence in the context of this larger and complex patriarchal family form is central to our discussion of the relationship between the patriarchy and violence.

Women's actions in the context of domestic violence have historically been dichotomized as follows: women who stay in violent relationships are victims, and women who leave are survivors. This categorization is especially prevalent in the Indian context. Patriarchal structure and restrictions in the Indian family system are uniformly blamed as the primary reason for women staying in violent relationships (Johnson & Johnson 2001). However, many researchers have argued that women's coping with patriarchal impositions must be examined beyond models of 'learned helplessness' (McLeer 1998, Mies 1980).

Researchers argue that when women are portrayed as being helpless to combat the violence, they are misrepresented. In fact, women even in the most restrictive surroundings seek help or try to reduce the violence, usually progressing from informal resources of help (such as natal family member, friends, or neighbors) to more formal institutions such as domestic violence shelters, police, and the courts (Goodman et al. 2003). So, investigations

of women's active role in engaging with domestic violence and patriarchal structure can better inform our understanding of their relationship. This concentration on women's actions can also contribute to social and legal efforts made to end violence against women (Bush 1992, Kishwar 1999, Ray 1999).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Attention to specific control contexts of violent incidents as well as the interest in examining women's reactions to the violence led me to the following primary research questions. Paying close attention to the specific interpersonal and intra-familial dynamics of control and coping mechanisms in a marital relationship, this project answers four main research questions: (1) What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence? (2) How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives? (3) What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts? and (4) How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?

The answers to these questions will also speak to a critical finding in my previous research: while patriarchal control in families is *central* to the understanding of domestic violence, the relationship between patriarchal structure and violence is complex and context-specific (Menon, 2003).

METHODOLOGY

For this research, I employ a blended methodology of qualitative and quantitative research to identify different types of control contexts in familial violence and the differential effects of these types of domestic violence. I use a combination of primary and secondary data. The secondary data for the project comes from the Demographic Health

Survey (DHS) of India, conducted in 1999. Since the main objective of the DHS India was to obtain state-level and national-level information on various aspects of women's health, and included a number of questions on domestic violence experienced by women, DHS India is extremely useful in understanding and analyzing the macro-sociological context of domestic violence in India. These large-scale survey data are used in conjunction with primary data to create a unique dataset that enabled me to better understand the micro- and macro-structures of domestic violence in India.

For primary data collection, a sample of 80 women was selected with the help of two organizations, Maval Mahila Vikas Sanstha (MMVS) and Shramik Mahila Morcha (SMM), who work with survivors of domestic abuse in Pune. Interviews were conducted over a period of six months from January to May, 2006. The data collection process consisted of two-part personal interviews. The first interview is a structured questionnaire of about 80 short questions. It records basic demographic information and assessments of marital quality, decision-making, experience with domestic violence, and coping strategies. These questions are modeled wherever possible on the DHS-India questions for comparability. The second interview is a semi-structured interview that allowed for more open-ended questions about the patterns of control and violence experienced by women. The interviews were conducted (with the help of a translator, Chitra Khare) in the regional language spoken in Pune (Marathi) and occasionally in Hindi, the national language of India.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One of the major findings of this research is that it documents, for the first time, the two different kinds of violence that are currently prevalent in Indian families: situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. Additionally, I was able to document that there are qualitative differences in the way women experience the different forms of violence. The

characteristics of intimate terrorism seem to translate very well across cultural contexts, as evidenced by the use of very similar control tactics by men in Indian and Western contexts.

In addition to the documentation of differences amongst the types of violence, I also found that women use different coping mechanisms to deal with the violence. Two of the major factors that determined women's coping strategies were financial resources (such as economic independence or financial support from natal families), and familial resources (such as emotional support from either the natal or the marital family). If women had one of the two resources, they were more likely to take pro-active steps to either end the relationship or end the violence within the relationship.

The broader intellectual merit of the project lies in its recognition of the two neglected aspects of domestic violence: (1) the complicated relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence; and (2) the role of women as actors in violent relationships. By addressing these two aspects of domestic violence, I hope to inform social and legal remedies to domestic violence in India. The broader implications of the study are to question the assumptions about the relationship of domestic violence and patriarchal structure, to investigate the variations of power and control within forms of domestic violence, and to recognize agency in women's experience of domestic violence. Thus, by conducting this research, I demonstrate the importance of making distinctions in domestic violence.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

Chapter 2 documents the relationship among patriarchal ideologies, domestic violence, and agency of women. To situate my study, I define the parameters of the domestic violence and patriarchal structure that are used in the dissertation. I also examine the relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence in the context of India. I

use the help of the domestic violence research done in India to support my arguments. Next, I examine the parameters of agency and coping in the context of domestic violence in India. In addition, I examine the relationship between agency exerted by women and their response to domestic violence. I do this with the help of existing research in the United States and India. I end this chapter with the main dissertation questions and the hypotheses associated with the questions

Chapter 3 focuses on the methodology of the dissertation. The first section describes the Demographic Health Survey, a national health survey that was conducted in 1999. I describe the sampling methods used in the survey, as well as the measurement of the variables used for this dissertation. Then, I describe the process of my primary data collection. Along with a description of the sample designs and field sites, I describe the various measures that were derived from the qualitative and quantitative interviews.

Chapter 4 presents most of the quantitative analyses of the dissertation. It first examines the influence of socio-demographic factors on the experience of domestic violence in India. I use bivariate and multivariate logistic regressions to assess the likelihood of experiencing domestic violence, controlling for various family and personal characteristics such as education, labor force participation and family structure. I then turn to the quantitative part of my primary data, and use cluster analysis to ascertain whether there are different types of domestic violence in India. Later, I describe the ways in which the types of domestic violence differ from each other on a number of family and personal characteristics such as marital happiness, family structure, decision-making in the household, use of alcohol, and coping. I primarily use cross-tabulations to assess these differences.

Chapter 5 focuses on the qualitative analysis of domestic violence. This analysis primarily consists of examining the various themes that emerged after examining different

kinds of control tactics that men used to dominate their wives. I also scrutinize the complexities of family and marital contexts that influence women's experience of domestic violence. In addition, I describe the importance of family and marital social role in understanding the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence.

Chapter 6 is similar in structure to Chapter 5 except, it analyses the qualitative narratives of coping mechanisms used by women. The first section describes the different coping mechanisms that are used by women in India. In the next section, I examine the influence of structural contexts, family context, and personal context on coping mechanisms. Along with this analysis, I investigate the efficacy of these coping mechanisms and the interaction amongst the different coping mechanisms.

Chapter 7 summarizes and reinforces the findings in Chapter 5 and 6 by examining three cases that exemplify the themes of the dissertation. I describe each case in great detail, comparing the history, progression and characteristics of violence in each of the cases. I then use narratives to compare and contrast the various control tactics used by husbands, the coping mechanisms, and the family and marital contexts of each of the women. The case studies illustrate the difficulty of making definitive statements about the relationship of domestic violence, patriarchal family forms, and agency of women.

Chapter 8 discusses the main findings of the dissertation and makes recommendations for further study. The first section summarizes the main results of the dissertation and illustrates the main contributions of the research. In the next section, I discuss the limitations of the study and the relevance of the study. Finally, I present a few recommendations to activists, researchers and theorists, so as to ensure that domestic violence can be better understood and policies can be implemented to alleviate its effect on women.

The new wife

On the third day she went down to the kitchen

Washed her hands, prepared the broth

Still unaware of her new mother's likings,

She asks his sister to taste.

Wang Chien

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An (un)common story

“Siddhi” lived with her husband and his parents for about 12 years. In the early years, it was financially hard and they couldn’t spend enough time together given his work as a teacher in the local school and her work as a farmer. But Siddhi’s husband took her out to movies, looked after the children when she was late, and helped her out with her chores in the house when she was tired. Their two sons excelled in school. Then Siddhi’s sister came to stay with them to complete her schooling. After a few years - almost overnight – at least according to Siddhi, her husband asked to find him another wife. When she refused, he started verbally abusing her. When she still resisted his idea of a second marriage, he hit her for the first time and told her he wanted to marry her sister. He wanted Siddhi to take the proposal of marriage to her parents. She refused and told him, if he wanted a second wife, he’d have to make his own arrangements. He beat her for the first time.

Meanwhile, Siddhi’s sister told her parents that she would not marry anyone else other than Siddhi’s husband. Her parents disowned her sister and washed their hands off the entire matter. Siddhi became afraid that her sister would remain unmarried and if she continued to stay with her husband, three lives would be destroyed. So, she left the household and arranged for her husband and her sister to get married to each other. Siddhi moved out of the house and set up another house with her two sons. In this house, she stayed with **his** parents and her two sons, while her husband stayed with her sister.

Soon after this, Siddhi’s ex-husband began coming to her home unannounced and regularly accusing her of being a loose woman. He would occasionally beat her, especially if he was drunk. He became extremely suspicious of her and would stalk her at her work. When asked why he continued to beat Siddhi after she had left him, he tells her – you didn’t allow me to marry your sister; you go around with guys. But Siddhi tells me – the real reason he beats me is because he no longer gets any money from me and I am leading an independent life from him. He no longer has any say in my life, in what I do, or where I go. So, he gets frustrated and beats me. I asked her – how do you cope? She says – I had a good life with him, now he drinks and beats my sister and me. I have no respect for him. So, I ignore him. I have my sons. They beat him up for me. I am quite happy.

This story is a very common story of domestic violence: Siddhi's husband wants something from her, so he beats her to get what he wants. She puts her family's interest before her own, sacrifices her happiness for her sister, and does what he wants her to do. Despite this, her husband continues to beat her. This is also an uncommon story of domestic violence. Siddhi's husband was not violent towards her for the first 12 years of their life together. He was a loving and attentive husband. When Siddhi's husband asks her to do what he wants, she refuses. Siddhi moves out and lives an independent life from her former husband. She uses her higher moral ground to shame him: his parents live with her, instead of with him. She uses her emotional and physical resources to get even with her husband: her sons beat up their dad. Despite her experience of violence, Siddhi is happy.

Most stories of domestic violence in India contain only one of the following themes: (1) a patriarchal husband beats his wife and she is a helpless victim at his mercy, or (2) a patriarchal husband beats his wife, but she triumphs over him and is liberated from the shackles of patriarchal control. The reality of domestic violence, however, lies in between. While the above themes are based to a large degree on the reality of domestic violence in India, they do not capture the diversity of domestic violence, the importance of women's actions in dealing with domestic violence, or the influence of socio-cultural factors. Without examining these three factors in tandem, only a partial picture of the dynamics of domestic violence emerges. Thus, to fully understand the use of domestic violence in India, I examine the relationships among patriarchal structure, domestic violence, and women's actions.

DEFINITIONS

Domestic violence

The term "domestic violence" has come to encompass a wide range of behavior. Common usage has been broadened to include all physical acts of violence that are domestic

in nature, i.e., between members of a family. Over time, this definition has been expanded even further to include non-physical aspects of the phenomenon, such as emotional, financial, or verbal abuse. In this dissertation, I define domestic violence only as physical acts of violence, while acknowledging that physical violence is often combined with other forms of abuse. Most definitions of domestic violence include three questions about violence, which I will address below: between whom, which acts and with what frequency?

Between whom? This study will focus on violence between spouses. In some cases, the spousal abuse is supported or instigated by other members of the family. Technically, this should be categorized as family violence. For the sake of simplicity, I examine only cases where the husband and the wife are the only actors or survivors of domestic violence. In addition, I also include any violence that occurred between the spouses after the dissolution of marriage. As in Siddhi's case, the violence can often persist even after the spouses live apart. Therefore, I define the actors of the violence as current or ex-marital partners who are or have been members of the same marital household.

Which acts? While there are several debates in the U.S. literature (Denzin 1984, Dobash & Dobash 1992, Straus 1999, Yllo 1988) about the extent and specific forms of violence, there is some consensus on the different categories of violence, and the acts of violence that define these categories:

- Physical violence includes slapping, kicking, beating, hitting, pushing, choking, burning, and threatening and assault with a weapon;
- Sexual violence includes sexual coercion, sexual harassment, and rape;
- Psychological abuse includes demeaning, insulting, threatening, isolating, and abandoning behaviors; and

- Financial abuse includes deprivation of material goods, control of money, and control of assets (Duvvury et al. 2004).

I examine physical abuse by following the guidelines implemented through the Conflict Tactics Scales (Steinmetz 1977, Straus 1999, Straus 1990), the most widely used operationalization of domestic violence. I rarely asked women questions specifically about sexual violence, but if women volunteered information about sexual violence, I classified it as part of domestic violence. Since I define domestic violence as exclusively physical acts of violence, I have conceptualized psychological and financial forms of abuse under the rubric of control instead of violence. This separation is central to the definition of the types of intimate partner violence and stands at the center of this study. In addition, this separation is important to examine the ways in which psychological and financial abuse can be used in non-violent relationships.

With what frequency? Domestic violence in this study is not limited to high frequency violence. While frequency of violence is an important characteristic of the violence, any incident of violence has important effects on the nature of a relationship. Thus, the definition of domestic violence in this study encompasses any physical or sexual violence, by individuals who were and are marital partners.

Patriarchal ideology and structure

In general terms, patriarchy is defined as a social ideology and social structure that systematically institutionalizes the dominance of men over women. Since I focus primarily on the ways in which patriarchal ideology manifests itself in family structure and family practices, I view patriarchy as a set of ideologies and practices that contribute to the

domination of women in the family.¹ In general, the effect of patriarchal ideology within the family can be seen by examining the duties and roles of each member of the household. It must be noted that these prescribed and ascribed roles and duties of each member of the family are not formed in isolation within the family. Patriarchal ideology often permeates other social structures such as governmental, educational, employment, and religious institutions. It is in interaction with these institutions that social roles within the patriarchal family are formed. Therefore, while I focus on patriarchal structure as it pertains to the family system, I do not discount the influences that other social institutions exert on the family system.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PATRIARCHAL STRUCTURE

Since Dobash & Dobash's influential study in 1979, patriarchal structures have been the primary lens through which domestic violence has been studied. One of the central tenets of feminist domestic violence research is that the violence is a manifestation and expression of the power and control that women experience in families (Dasgupta & Warrier 1996, Desai & Krishnaraj 1990, Dobash & Dobash 1992). This analysis of power and control has also been the focus of feminist family researchers who see the patriarchal structure of families as a way to appropriate women's labor in families (Thompson 1992, Thorne 1982). Feminist scholars have argued that the systems of patriarchy within and outside of the family are responsible not only for the instigation of domestic violence, but also for sustaining and in some instances, condoning it. So, an intimate understanding of the structure of the Indian family system is important to understand the ways in which domestic violence is instigated, sustained, and condoned by family members.

¹ Throughout the dissertation, the term patriarchy is used as a shorthand for the diverse and often contradictory set of ideologies and practices that men and women have knowledge of and access to.

Indian family systems

The Indian patriarchal family can be termed as classical patriarchy (Kandiyotti 1998) with the joint family structure as one of the manifestations of hierarchical family systems. In the most general terms, the joint family system comprises a group of people who live under one roof, cook food at one hearth, and hold property in common. The patriarch of the family makes most of the important decisions for the family. The structure of the family tends to control freedom of movement and paid remuneration for female members, and in general, there is a gendered segregation of work and family space. Hierarchical relationships (between father and son, or mother-in-law and daughter-in-law) are privileged over conjugal relationships (husband and wife). Researchers argue that this emphasis on hierarchical relationships rather than horizontal relationships is one of the primary characteristics of the joint family system (Tambiah 1989).

In addition, joint family members participate in common family rituals and practices, and most importantly, are related to each other by blood or marriage (Mies 1980). Joint families in India operate with an ideology of joint production and joint consumption of common resources. Individual identity is de-emphasized, and the family provides a sense of security for the sustenance of all its members (Bhatti 1990, Tambiah 1989).

The nuclear family in India, consisting of the husband-wife dyad and any children from the marriage, is often considered to be a breakaway form from the larger joint family system. Recently, researchers have questioned whether the joint family system is the foundation of the nuclear system (Madhurima 1996, Visaria 1999). They argue that this form of the patriarchal joint family system is prototypical of an upper class/upper caste family system and is not representative of family systems in India. Even with this critique, the nuclear family in India has some unique qualities that distinguish it from nuclear families

found in the West. The nuclear family in India can be more adequately described as an 'adaptive extended family' wherein ties with extended family members are very strong, even if the families are dispersed geographically (Mahajan 1990b). Thus, the role definitions of the Indian nuclear family do not differ tremendously from those of the joint family system.

One of the primary ways in which patriarchal structure manifests itself in the Indian family structure is that it develops along age and gender lines (Mies 1980). In this hierarchy of relationships, women are always subordinate to men. Although older women might influence the decisions of the household through covert control, they are rarely recognized as the head of the household. In this system, the daughter-in-law, the woman entering a new household, becomes the most subordinate adult of the family and has to adjust so as not to create any friction in the new household (Visaria 1999).

Researchers studying violence in the family argue that it is when women first enter the marital family that they are at their most vulnerable. For example, if the new member is unable to adjust to the household, violence is sometimes used to elicit obedience from her (Goel 2005, Goody & Tambiah 1973, Madhurima 1996). Additionally, if the woman entering the household does not succumb to traditional socialization and does not conform to traditional gender roles, she is more likely to be beaten by her family. Some research indicates that the threat of violence is often used instead of actual violence to elicit conciliatory responses from women in the household (Peacock 2003).

These acts of violence are socially accepted with some qualifications (Agnes 1990, Srinivasan 1998). Although violence against women is generally frowned upon, there is a degree of cultural acceptance of men 'disciplining' a wife. As in Siddhi's case, a man can put a woman in her 'place' in that if she does not listen to him, he is free to hit her (Agnes, 1990). Putting women in their 'place' is an oft-repeated phrase used by men who report that

they have beaten their wives (Bhatti 1990). Indian families are both a site of emotional, financial and physical support for women and of the emotional, financial, and physical oppression of women. The Indian patriarchal family structure is an institution that creates unequal relationships between partners so that one person is able to emotionally, physically, and mentally take control of another, with or without the use of violence.

Different types of domestic violence

While patriarchy, culture, and family structure are critical to our understanding of domestic violence (Johnson & Johnson 2001, Peacock 2003, Report 1999), feminists have often taken for granted a fairly simple relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert 1997). In addition, many researchers studying the South Asian Diaspora and the South Asian sub-continent see the prevalence of domestic violence as a manifestation of patriarchal values in the family (Krishnan 2005, Vindhya 2000, Visaria 1999) and as an instrument that is used by men to keep women in their place (Ray 1999).

However, the precise channels through which this systematic control and power is exerted are not always clear. Indeed, the assessment of the relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence is often circular in nature. One hears both that India is patriarchal because it has high rates of domestic violence and that there are high rates of domestic violence in India because it is patriarchal in nature. The nature of the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence is often unspecified and the processes that influence this relationship are left unmarked.

One of the primary sources of information regarding the complicated relationship of patriarchy and domestic violence in the United States comes from Johnson (1995). He demonstrated that there are multiple forms of partner violence in families, which have a complicated relationship with dynamics of power and control. He identified three major

types of domestic violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence (Johnson 1995, Johnson & Ferraro 2000, Leone et al. 2004).

Intimate Terrorism is the form of domestic violence that is embedded in a generalized pattern of coercive control that one partner exerts over the other. In this form of domestic violence, the acts of violence are only one of the many forms of control that the intimate terrorist uses against the partner. This is the form of violence that is typically identified in studies of women who have been habitually beaten and harassed by their husbands. Partners experiencing intimate terrorism tend to seek both informal help and the help of formal agencies such as the police or women's shelters. This form of violence is almost entirely male-perpetrated.

Violent Resistance is the form of violence that some victims of intimate terrorism (almost always women) use to resist their partner's control attempts. The resistor, although using violence, is not attempting to exert general control over her partner, and the violence is used against a partner who is both violent and controlling.

Situational Couple Violence is the form of domestic violence that does not come from either partner's need for control over the other partner. The violence arises from the particular dynamics of a specific conflict or series of conflicts, and the motive of the violence is not the exercise of generalized control over the partner.

Research in the U.S. and U.K. on this framework has indicated that these types are identifiable across different population and in different contexts (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Johnson 2001, Leone et al. 2004, Rosen & Bird 1996). Studies on the health outcomes, coping, and marital quality of these different forms of domestic violence have indicated that the experience of individuals in different kinds of violent relationships are affected by the

level of generalized pattern of control that one partner exhibits over another (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Johnson 2001, Leone et al. 2004, in press)).

This finding is especially important in the context of domestic violence in India because the violence within the home is invariably tied to the patriarchal 'cultural' practices. So, domestic violence in India is automatically deemed a product of 'culture' (Ahmad et al. 2004, Almeida & Dolan-Delvecchio 1999), often neglecting that it is also a product of interpersonal relationships within the family structure.

While it cannot be denied that there are some definite cultural markers for many social phenomena, examining only 'cultural' explanations for an interpersonal or a family structural problem serves to create dichotomies of violent experiences that may not exist (Grewal 1998, Ong 1987). For example, violence against women takes on the form of female genital mutilation in some parts of Africa and the Middle-East, acid attacks in Bangladesh and Pakistan, gun violence in the United States, and dowry deaths in India. While each of these phenomena is particular to the cultural context, using only the 'culture' of Africa, Asia, or the United States is inadequate to explain the acts of violence.

Even while the similarity of violent experiences across cultural contexts is rarely examined, the diversity of violent experiences within cultural contexts is also neglected. For example, it is quite important to keep in mind that Siddhi's case may be similar to the experiences of an American woman; it is also important to remember that Siddhi's case differs dramatically from other cases of domestic violence in her village. Thus, we cannot confine ourselves to a monolithic notion of patriarchal family structure, because it constructs a homogeneous notion of patriarchy that does not hold true across all contexts (Magar 2001, Mani 1998).

Furthermore, my quantitative research on domestic violence in India suggested that family violence against women was actually less likely in strongly patriarchal family settings than it was in less patriarchal settings (Menon 2003). I found strong evidence that when power is concentrated along patriarchal lines, the likelihood of using violence is **reduced** because the power structure effectively imposes cultural, social, and physical restrictions on women. I interpreted these findings in terms of Jackman's (1994) theory that violence is used only as a last resort after all other structural controls have failed. The two main conclusions that emerged from my study that are critical to the study of domestic violence in India are: (1) patriarchy does not necessarily lead to the use of violence, and (2) violence may be used primarily as a means of last resort, after all other control tactics have failed.

This is because physical violence is usually unnecessary to secure a man's control over a woman. One of the ways men secure control over women is by using the system of coercive love: "women are praised and rewarded for compliant behaviors and stigmatized for non-cooperation" (Jackman 1994). Jackman (1994) has successfully argued that one of the reasons that violent men are ostracized by society is because they violate basic principles of social control, and become a source of political embarrassment, invoking moral condemnation for their actions. Instead of being a manifestation of a system of power and control, the violence in a relationship indicates a breakdown of that system.

Social inequalities between individuals, especially relationships between men and women within families, are not always resolved through the overt expression of power and control. For example, almost a year had passed between Siddhi's husband's first request for a second marriage and his first assault. He did not start hitting her as soon as she refused him permission for a second marriage. He first plied her with reasons about why it was a reasonable request. The reason he tried to convince her of the sensibility of his request is

because his request went beyond any normative behavior or expectation that characterizes marital relationships in India.

In many social relations where dominant and subordinate groups have to live in close proximity, the dominance and subordination are supported by ideologies that mask the hierarchical relationship. In family relations, these ideologies involve the narratives of love, romance, and marriage that set down normative behaviors and social role expectations for each of the parties. One of the benefits of these normative behaviors is the avoidance of open hostilities (Jackman 1994). For the subordinate, resistance to such covert forms of domination is difficult because the justification for the domination is institutionalized in social, religious, and cultural discourses about the family.

Dominant groups thus avoid the need to exert force and control to subdue resistance. For example, if Siddhi had accepted her husband's reasoning for the second marriage, she would likely have avoided any physical violence from her husband. Persuasion through social practice and ideology can dominate with minimum questions. So, institutionalization of dominant relationships is one of the many processes through which dominant groups view their benefits as the natural outcome of individual power and ignore the fact that these benefits are inequitably distributed and come at a cost to the dominated (Brace & Davidson 2000, Jackman 1994).

These normative behaviors and role expectations are usually visible at the point of the breakdown wherein every order reveals its systematic contradictions (Jackman 1999, Kandiyotti 1998). For example, if Siddhi had accepted her husband's reasons, not only would he be living with two wives as per his wishes, he would also not have to acknowledge, at least openly, that the arrangement was unfairly imposed on his wife. His power and authority over Siddhi would have remained unchallenged. But given he was not granted his

request, his position and authority as her husband were threatened, and he started to use violence against Siddhi. Hence, on many occasions such as this one, violent acts can often expose the rules and regulations of family relationships and make the hidden power and control that are used against family members visible.

In addition, Siddhi was very aware that her husband could well marry her sister without her consent, but that his status in the extended family network and in the community would have been drastically affected if she had not consented to the marriage. One of the primary reasons she consented to the marriage was to ensure that the entire village would not ostracize her sister. Thus, violence in the marital home is not only affected by internal norms and expectations, but also by the norms and expectations of the larger society, in this case, the village. Examining this larger context is also important because researchers have found that there is a substantial influence of structural factors such as education, labor force participation, and financial independence in predicting women's experience of violence. Given the interactive nature of patriarchy and violence documented in earlier sections, I argue that in the context of India, the socio-cultural contexts of domestic violence must be examined so that the complicated relationship between patriarchy and violence can be clearly enunciated.

Domestic violence research in India

The influence exerted by the socio-cultural contexts in India on family relationships is hard to summarize because of the diversity of cultural contexts. With independence in 1947, the Indian nation-state organized its vast territory into various states on linguistic grounds. Hence, distinctions among social life and practices are best assessed by comparisons across states. To get a better idea about the diversity present in India, researchers recommend comparing India to what Europe would look like if it were

functioning as one country (Deshpande 2001). Because of differences in economic, social and physical conditions in each individual state, researchers often find it useful to compare across states to assess the impact of culture on a social phenomenon (Kishwar 1999, Leonard 1979, Mehra 1997, Narasimhan 1994).

Women's position in Indian society has been shaped primarily by the ideology of the household (D'Cruz & Bharat 2001). Although the family is theoretically a sanctuary for women, with the help of its restrictive norms it can act more as a prison with a code of conduct that women are socialized to follow (Abraham, 1995). In India, the outside world is sometimes considered so dangerous to the honor of the women in certain sub-populations that stepping outside the threshold of a household leads to excommunication and banishment from 'civil' society (Ganesh 1989). It must be reiterated that violence, even in these contexts, is often not the norm. Violence is still used as a means of last resort, and is used only when normative controls of duty, social role, and limited physical mobility are lost to the family or the husband. Violence, while acceptable in some contexts in India, is still considered an aberration of family life. Thus, the most important way in which to assess the understanding of the mechanisms of patriarchy is to examine an individual family structure within larger social and political institutions (Jackman 1994).

Studies have shown that there is a relationship between women's autonomy and their experience of violence (Visaria 1999). Domestic violence has been found to be associated with level of education, alcoholism, inadequate payment of dowries, neglect of household duties, disobedience, and suspicions of sexual infidelity (Bhatti 1990, Daga et al. 1998, Srinivasan 1998). Out of the many factors that influence domestic violence, education and working status of women seem to be protective factors. Researchers postulate that women who do not work outside their homes are more likely to be de-valued since they are not

productive members of the society. Indeed, they have fewer economic resources and are more likely to be restricted within their households. For this reason, researchers have theorized that women are more likely to be beaten if they are not employed (Leonard 1979, Levinson 1989). However, there is some debate about this issue. Many researchers contend that women are also more likely to be monitored on account of their working status or activity outside the household. Also, non-working women probably receive more social support because they conform to the traditional gender role prescriptions (Dasgupta & Warriar 1996).

Another powerful predictor of wife battery is the socioeconomic status of the family. Studies have shown that there is an inverse relationship between socioeconomic status and physical violence (Bhatti 1990, Madhurima 1996, Vindhya 2000). However, there are many possible explanations for this pattern. Some researchers argue that the reason for this finding is due to defining domestic violence only as physical violence. They found that physical violence is more likely to be used by the lower classes whereas upper class women face higher rates of emotional and verbal abuse (Bhatti 1990). This inverse relationship could potentially be due to the lower rates of reporting among the higher classes. Because of the social stigma attached to wife battery in the middle and higher classes, women are more likely to be socialized to see violence in their homes as private and are less likely to report it (Madhurima 1996).

In fact, this problem of under-reporting among the upper echelons has made it very difficult to estimate the exact rates of domestic violence in India. There are severe social sanctions on women for even acknowledging that violence takes place in the house; so women do not generally come forward to report the violence. Examinations of health records reveal that women who are hospitalized because of beatings by their husbands refuse

to identify or report the perpetrator (Daga et al. 1998, Vindhya 2000, Visaria 1999). Given these circumstances, it is extremely hard to estimate the true rates of domestic violence in India.

Another complication that interferes with an accurate estimation even in survey research is the respondent's definition of violence. An International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) report indicates that if women believe that a justification could be given for a violent act, emotional or physical, they do not perceive it to be violent and do not report the incident as violent. Thus, the statistics about the prevalence of domestic violence are merely the tip of the iceberg (Daga et al. 1998). Because there has been no nationally representative sample that exclusively examined domestic violence, I rely on official estimates from the Ministry of Law, Justice, and Company Affairs that speculates that over 60% of urban households experiences domestic violence (defined by the Indian Legal system as physical and mental torture), out of which 5% report the matter to the police and prosecute the perpetrator of the abuse (Jaising 2001).

These high numbers vary from study to study. In one study, two-thirds of the sample (346 randomly selected women from 5 villages) experienced some form of abuse, while 40% of them experience severe beating and sexual assault (Visaria 1999). In another study, Mahajan (Mahajan 1990a) examined 252 households with a total population of 1156 and reported that 13% of the lower caste women reported violent behavior from their husbands, while 75% of their husbands report beating their wives. In some hospital studies, Daga et al. (Daga et al. 1998) reported that among the definite cases of domestic violence (where an individual identified the attacker as her husband), 44% had been kicked, beaten, punched, choked and/or strangled.

Because of limited resources, researchers tend to select small samples in cities or villages and interview or study them for a period of time. The findings thus generated, as a whole, are wide ranging because of the contextual factors that define the particular sample. For example, researchers studying violence in Chandigarh, Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and Karnataka produce varied estimates of domestic violence that range from 33% to 66% ((Magar 2001, Mitra 1999, Poonacha & Pandey 1999, Rao et al. 2000, Rao 1998). Although these studies are small, they give us a wealth of information regarding the contextual factors that frame domestic violence in India.

One of the major benefits of examining the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence in the context of these larger socio-cultural factors is that it gives us an insight into the conditions and motivations of families resorting to the use of violence. Another benefit is that it helps us understand the complex ways in which families cope with violence. Research on patriarchy and domestic violence has historically neglected the ways in which women use symbolic and material power in family relationships to cope with violence (Kandiyotti 1998, Kranichfeld 1996). For example, Siddhi not only used her separation from her husband as a physical means of coping with the violence, but also gained higher moral ground within the extended family and community networks. Thus, any research on the relationship between domestic violence and patriarchal structure must take into consideration not only the ways in which power and control are negotiated by family members, but also the ways in which these family members strive to redistribute power imbalances in a variety of contexts.

COPING MECHANISMS

Women's responses to domestic violence in India have historically been characterized as follows: women as helpless victims unable to leave their relationship

because of their submission to patriarchal norms; or women as ‘superwomen’ who triumph over patriarchal norms and emerge as independent, self-sufficient women, free from violence. This dichotomy of choices is unrepresentative of the diversity of experiences that women have, as well as the diversity of women’s responses to domestic violence. The woman-as-victim narrative is especially problematic because it neglects any form of agency that women might have over the violent situation. For example, while Siddhi finally left her husband’s relationship, she tried for a long time (at least a year) to save her marriage and convince her husband to see that he was making a mistake. Her (forced) departure from the household did not end the violence. Her husband was a frequent visitor to her house after the separation and the violence she experienced rose significantly after she set up her own household. Thus, our examination of domestic violence in India must include women’s coping with violence and patriarchal norms that goes beyond the model of ‘learned helplessness’ or ‘super women’ (McLeer 1998, Mies 1980).

Conceptualizing agency and coping

Agency can be defined simply as an act of free will or choice of an individual. Researchers argue that in Western contexts, the use of ‘free will’ and choice tends to be taken for granted because of the high individuation of family relationships (Fernandez 1997, Flax 1990, Komter 1989). Regardless of context, be it Western or Indian, unpacking the concept of agency is a highly complicated project. In fact, recognizing, naming, and representing any act from a subordinate member of society as an act of agency has been the focus of many feminist debates (Gubar 1998, Harding 1986, McLeer 1998, Naples 2003, Patai 1988). The greatest philosophical debate of third-wave feminism has been about whether an oppressed individual (read: woman in a violent relationship) can exercise agency or be *seen* as exercising agency (Gubar 1998, Harding 1986, McLeer 1998, Naples 2003, Patai

1988). In fact, the recognition and representation of the act of agency is often considered to be as important as the act itself.

Historically, in the realm of domestic violence, definitions of coping have focused on behaviors oriented toward leaving the relationship. However, Goodman et al. (2003) have recently developed an index of coping to more broadly define women's coping responses to violence. The index contains six categories of coping:

- Formal network: this includes getting help from clergy, employers, and doctors, talking to people in institutions such as domestic violence shelters and the police, and trying to get her husband or herself to private counseling or addiction centers;
- Legal network: this includes filing formal petitions for Protection from Abuse (PFA), criminal charges, and formal petitions for restitution for violence, divorce, or child support;
- Safety planning: this includes hiding money, saving money to be used later, developing a code to warn neighbors if she was in danger, changing locks to improve safety;
- Informal networks: this includes talking to family, neighbors and friends to protect children or themselves, staying with family or friends, sending children to family to ensure their safety;
- Resistance: this includes fighting physically, shouting back, refusing to do anything her husband tells her to do, leaving home, and fighting back verbally; and
- Placating: this includes trying to keep quiet and doing whatever he wants, trying to avoid him or any argument with him.

These categorizations are merely for purposes of simplicity. Because research has indicated that women use a combination of coping mechanisms uniquely fitted to their particular situation (Dasgupta & Warriar 1996, Dunn & Powell 2005), the index is primarily used as a template to identify women's actions against violence.

AGENCY AND COPING

In general, there are three main narratives of agency when it comes to violent relationships: agency-as-missing, agency-as-exit, and agency-as-prevention (Lloyd & Emery, 2005). Agency-as-missing is usually applied to women who stay in relationships. In this narrative, agency and victimhood are categories in a dichotomy, with no middle ground. If a woman is an agent, then she is not a victim; if she is a victim, then she is not an agent. The most prevalent discourse about women being helpless victims in the face of oppressive patriarchal structures (with no hope of escaping them) features the agency-as-missing narrative prominently.

Another prevalent narrative about women's coping is agency-as-exit. In this case, the question asked mostly about women in violent relationships is – why do they stay in the relationship? Here, we also see the dichotomous category of agent and victim being used, but the emphasis is more on the leaving behavior as an indicator of agency and victimhood. If she stays in the relationship, she is a victim; if she leaves the relationship, she is a survivor. For example, in each of these narratives, if Siddhi had stayed with her husband, she would be a victim, and since she left, she would be considered a survivor.

Agency-as-prevention is often used when women are blamed for the violence. In this case, women are endowed with 'super-agency', so that not only are they held responsible for the violence, but also for the prevention of it. In fact, many women and caseworkers who service battered women often give 'suggestions' to women to combat the problem of

violence, while both parties often acknowledge that the violence is likely to persist regardless of anything they do. The problem with each of these narratives is that while they neglect the impact of high control contexts on women, they simultaneously reject the diversity of circumstances under which women experience violence.

Alternatively, the agency of a woman experiencing violence should be constructed not as a particular physical or a psychological act, but one that increases her power in the household, even if it is through the use of patriarchal ideologies. For example, a unique feature of the Indian patriarchal family system is that it is based on hierarchical lines of power. While power in the family is unevenly divided between the genders, women have access to it as they grow older and gain higher status in the family. Even though women might be victimized by violence in the family, this does not always imply that they wield no authority in the household. In both Western and Indian contexts, mothers have moral and physical authority over children. In the joint family system, this authority gets extended to other members of the household (Srinivasan 1998).

There have been a number of studies that document the tensions and conflict between the mother-in-law and the daughter-in-law in India (Mahajan 1990a, Martin 1999, Mehrotra 1999, Shiva 1999). Although men have physical and symbolic power and control over the family, they delegate limited authority over household matters to women (Jackman 1994). This power becomes the source of animosity between two individuals in a family system wherein the power gets transferred from one individual to the other in the course of time (Mies 1980). The hostility between the two women is thus not necessarily a product of interpersonal relationships (although that might well be the case), but also an institutionalized role expectation (Jackman 1994, Mies 1980)

The patriarchal structure of the family imposes a hierarchical relationship between individual members. For instance, the relationship between a mother-in-law and her daughter-in-law is similar to a relationship between a superior and a subordinate. It bears repeating that this power is generally bestowed upon women by male members of the family. In a patriarchal joint family, where older women are dependent on the head of the household for financial and emotional sustenance, they tend to become agents of the male members in 'supervising' the younger females in the family. This supervision sometimes takes the form of harassment or beatings. Although being 'agents' of male power in the hierarchical family structure carries stigma of its own (prominent among which is the vilification of the figure of mother-in-law), using this limited power can prove to be very useful for women in dealing with violence. For example, Siddhi could not benefit from the hierarchical power structure when she was younger. But when her sons grew older and she gained status and prestige within the family system, she was able to deploy her sons to defend her.

In addition, women's coping must be examined in the context of the different forms of patriarchal control that families exert (McLeer 1998, Mies 1980). When women strategize within a limited set of options and have varying degrees of control imposed upon them by the patriarchal family structure, they evaluate these options based on varying potential for resistance or reaction to oppression (Kandiyotti 1998). For example, women in many African communities have historically earned their own wages, without depending on their husbands for their 'maintenance', thus giving them enough leverage to negotiate their lives. At the same time, this system does not afford them the security and well-being that comes from being dependent on a higher steady income of a classical patriarchal husband. Hence, coping can be examined in terms of material considerations (women's rights, compensation,

and protection under patriarchal norms), ideological considerations (the roles of wife, daughter, and mother), and coercive considerations (if you don't do this, this will happen to you).

Moving away from agency-as-resistance enables us to find a more diverse set of agentic actions and help us reject the idea of the strong, rebellious woman as the only icon of agentic action against domestic violence. Indeed, many feminists have successfully argued that examining only resistance behaviors gives us only a partial picture. They argue instead, that victimization and resistance function in tandem and in interaction with each other (Dunn & Powell 2005). Thus, we must examine women's actions in response to violence in the Indian patriarchal family as an interaction with and against family scripts or role expectations that are defined and limited by the socio-cultural contexts of a patriarchal family. Recognizing this interaction between patriarchal context and women's coping, some researchers have identified a few micro- and macro- factors that influence women's specific responses to violence.

Coping research in India

Researchers who have examined coping in the United States have documented that, in contrast to early impressions of learned helplessness, women in situations of high control violence display increased activity of either resistance or negotiation with their intimate partners (Dunn & Powell 2005, Duvvury et al. 2004, Goodman et al. 2003). They not only negotiate with their partners, they also reach outside the household to increase the safety of their children, their dependents, and themselves.

While earlier research tended to create a model of 'learned helplessness', more research on the subject has demonstrated active participation on the part of the women to seek help, usually progressing from informal resources such as friends, neighbors and

employers to more formal institutions such as domestic violence shelters, police, and the courts (Goodman et al. 2003). Women had often initially hoped that the violence would stop, but when the hope was gone, they tended to take active steps to leave the relationship. This shift in theoretical perspective reframed women from victims of domestic violence to survivors of domestic violence to indicate the struggle, active participation, and agency exerted by women when dealing with a violent partner.

We find very similar patterns of coping in India as well. Much of this research has been done on help-seeking behavior from formal agencies such as the government, the police, or women's groups. Right from the 1980s, feminist activists and women's groups have been in the forefront of legislation that has criminalized domestic violence. This has not been very easy, given the bureaucratic nature of the legislative system. India inherited its legal system from the British Raj; consequently, the laws that apply to women today are filtered through religious and caste identity just as they were during the colonial rule (Moore 1994, Ray 1999). Hindus, Sikhs, Christians and women of other faiths are subject to remarkably different marriage laws (Moore 1994). Some of these laws have never been modified and are still relics from the British Raj. For example, Christian women contemplating divorce have to contend with an 1869 divorce law that requires proof of adultery, desertion, or cruelty (Ray 1999).

The introduction of new legislation that criminalized violence in the home has changed the legal landscape substantially (Ray 1999). The Dowry Death Law (Section 498a) and the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act of 2005 have been successfully passed, in an effort to criminalize domestic violence to provide legal rights for women experiencing intimate partner violence. The most recent law covers all conjugal relationships and does not distinguish between married and unmarried couples.

In addition, the definition of domestic violence was expanded to define physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, and economic violence. One of the more important features of the 2005 Act was to secure women's rights to the marital home in the event of eviction or abandonment. It also provides for protection from harassment of the woman or her relatives from her husband, in addition to protection from confiscation of her property. These laws have substantially changed the way domestic violence is viewed by the general public and have also significantly helped women's organizations in their efforts to stop domestic violence.

However, there are problems with the conceptualization and implementation of this law. Although the Act, for the first time since 1984, takes into consideration mental and physical torture, the laws continue to appraise the primary role of the woman as the caregiver, the mother, the wife of the household in evaluating the merits of the case. The other measuring stick is the severity of violence used in a violent incident. For example, many judges rule the 'normal' or 'mundane' violence in the household as ineligible under the law (Agnes 1990, Sengupta 1998). In one case, the presiding judge dismissed the domestic violence by declaring that "stray domestic quarrels, perfunctory abuses by mother-in-law to daughter-in-law in the Indian society [are] mundane matters of normal occurrence in the traditional joint Hindu family" (Vindhya, 2000: quoting the decision made in *Padmabai vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*). In addition, recent reports have suggested that there has been a backlash against these measures. For example, many men's groups claim that they have been the victims of women's ceaseless legislation against their rights (Sangari 2002).

In this context, there are two things Indian women can do if they have to respond to violence in the judicial system: (1) file a criminal case to get their husbands into jail, or (2) file a civil case to get alimony, child support, and protection from continued harassment

(Ahmed-Ghosh 2004). Most women choose the latter. But Indian court systems are not known for their speedy trials, and so the women sometimes have to wait 10 years or more to get their demands met, if they are met at all. Therefore, women who have decided to leave the relationship and want to undertake legal action against their husband usually use this option. Not a lot is known about the strategies women use when they want to maintain the relationship and do not want to end it.

As with women in the U.S., many Indian women use more than one type of coping strategy, depending on their financial and emotional resources. They are not likely to restrict themselves to using only formal networks (Goodman et al. 2003). In addition, it is likely that Indian women begin by using private means of coping, moving on to informal networks, finally moving to formal networks and attempting to end the relationship (Goodman et al. 2003). One of the problems with this assumption of a linear pattern of coping is that the emphasis continues to be on leaving behavior of women. Even while organizations and researchers understand the constraints within which Indian women operate, women who stay are often seen as victims, and women who leave as survivors.

This dichotomy of choices is often applied to Indian women, especially when they insist on going back into the household even after their abandonment by their violent husbands. Even after Indian feminists successfully petitioned and passed the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act of 2005, which specifically asserts women's rights over their marital homes, there is often impatience in feminist organizations about Indian women's insistence on returning to their violent husbands.

Because violence within the home is often concerned with identifying the enemy (invariably the man), social service agencies find it especially hard to provide services to differently constituted women whose experiences of abuse are simplified into easy 'cultural'

explanations of patriarchal oppression (Abraham 1999, Abraham 2002, Grewal 1998). Most violence in the patriarchal Indian home is attributed to patriarchal beliefs and the manifestations of a culture that is tolerant of violence. But we cannot fully understand the influence of social structures (such as the nation-state, religion, work force, family structure) on domestic violence unless we take into consideration the interactions that individuals have with these social structures.

Mohanty (2003) has argued that Indian women are not merely located within the patriarchal family structure as wives, daughters, or mother-in-laws; it is within these patriarchal structures that women as Indian wives, Indian daughters, and Indian mother-in-laws are constructed, often being defined within and by the patriarchal structure. For example, the desired characteristics of an Indian woman as self-sacrificing, gentle, patient, caring, or homely are not created in a vacuum. These desired characteristics are often designed to serve a specific purpose in the Indian family household, and are closely aligned to the roles to the woman play in the household. Thus, the construction of an Indian woman cannot necessarily be dissociated from the context of the Indian family. The violence experienced by Indian women must be situated in a specific familial context, so as to clearly detail the influences that families have on the identities of women.

The only problem with this concentration on the specificity of contexts is that it disintegrates into conversations of difference usually based on 'culture', without paying attention to socio-historical processes that 'produce' these differences (Mani 1998, Narayan 1997). For example, many women living in immigrant communities are automatically categorized into an oppressed subject by social service agencies and the judicial system in the host country. This simplified explanation of patriarchal-husband-as-tyrant and woman-as-submissive-wife does not take into consideration the variation of domestic violence,

socioeconomic factors in the marital home, the racist climate in a foreign country, and patriarchal narratives that are prevalent in both host and home countries.

In order to study violence in the family context, simultaneous attention must be paid not only to the specific contexts within which violence takes place, but also to the ‘cultural’ explanations that are often applied to violence against Indian woman. Thus, to get an accurate picture of the nature of domestic violence in India, simplistic relationships among patriarchal structures, agency, and violence must be re-examined to include other interpersonal elements such as marital communication or expectations.

DISSERTATION QUESTIONS

This dissertation is concerned with two central concerns: the relationship between patriarchal control and domestic violence, and the primary means by which women cope with violence from their husbands. In addition, I want to examine the influence of education, religion, labor force participation, financial independence, and socioeconomic status on patriarchal control, domestic violence, and women’s coping in the Indian family. In light of the complex relationships among patriarchal structure, domestic violence, and agency, the specific questions of this dissertation are:

1. What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence?
2. How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives?
3. What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts?
4. How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?

I argue that the answers to these questions will help: (1) question the assumptions about the relationship of domestic violence and patriarchal structure, (2) investigate the variations of power and control within forms of domestic violence, (3) recognize agency in women's experiences of domestic violence; and (4) provide legal and social agencies with conceptual and practical tools to deal with women's experience of domestic violence.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY

I first explore the macro context of violence in the country by the means of secondary data, and then examine the specific types of violence and coping in a micro context with the help of primary data. According to a study done by the International Center for Research on Women (ICRW), domestic violence depends on not only the characteristics and situation of the woman, such as her place of residence, her religion, her family type, or her socio-economic status, but also on the norms of acceptable behavior (ICRW 1998). These structural influences are broadly categorized into regional (and/or cultural) variability, family characteristics, and personal characteristics.

In order to examine the larger socio-cultural context of domestic violence in India, I use the Demographic Health Survey of India (DHS India) that collected information from approximately 90,000 women about various aspects of women's health, including their experiences of domestic violence. These data are useful for investigating the impact of family characteristics (such as family structure, socioeconomic status of the family, decision-making in the household), and personal characteristics (such as literacy, labor force participation, and attitudes towards domestic violence). I test the impact of the regional variation, family characteristics, and personal characteristics on the likelihood of experiencing domestic violence using a series of logistic regressions.

Because DHS India did not contain information about specific control contexts or coping, I conducted 80 structured and semi-structured interviews in the city of Pune, India. From the quantitative data derived from these interviews, I first examine whether there are different kinds of domestic violence. Then, I study the impact of various family characteristics (such as family structure, socioeconomic status of the family, decision-making in the household) and personal characteristics (such as literacy, labor force participation, and attitudes towards domestic violence) on the different kinds of violence, using a series of cross-tabulations. In addition, I use the qualitative data from the 80 interviews to study: (1) the differential impact of control in the types of domestic violence, and (2) the dimensions of coping used in response to the different types of violence.

I divide the analyses of domestic violence by the following themes: control tactics used by husbands, the role of alcohol, the role of family context (family structure, family as the cause or source of violence), marital context (marital happiness, marital communications or expectations), and family/marital social role. With respect to coping, I examine the types of coping strategies women use in response to the types of violence. I also investigate the influence of structural contexts, family context, and personal context on coping mechanisms. Along with this analysis, the efficacy of these coping mechanisms and the interaction amongst the different coping mechanisms are also scrutinized.

In addition, I present three cases that exemplify the different types of domestic violence and coping that mark the landscape of patriarchal families in India. I first compare the history, progression, and characteristics of violence in each of the cases. I then examine the control tactics used by husbands, the family context, and the marital context in each of the cases. Taken together, these analyses help me to get a clear understanding of the specific patriarchal contexts in which domestic violence in India takes place.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the research done in the field of domestic violence and coping in India, I present a set of hypotheses predicting the influence of socio-cultural factors on the incidence of violence. A cautionary note must be added. Given that there has been little or no research on the different kinds of coping or different types of domestic violence, the quantitative and qualitative analyses pertaining to the differential impact of coping and domestic violence are exploratory in nature, and any hypotheses with regard to these analyses are somewhat speculative.

Types of violence and coping mechanisms

I anticipate finding at least two types of domestic violence in India. Although there have been no studies documenting situational couple violence, given the similarity in characteristics of intimate terrorism in both countries (Margolis 1993, Radford 2000, Yoshioka et al. 2001) and the diversity of family contexts in India, it is reasonable to assume that other types of violence that are not intimately tied to generalized patterns of control are likely to exist. In addition, almost all of the research done in India has identified the use of alcohol as one of the major factors that influence the use of violence against the woman (ICRW 1998, Pande 2000, Report 1999, Visaria 1999). Therefore, I anticipate that the use of alcohol is going to play a major role in the experience of violence.

Family structure is likely to influence the different types of domestic violence. Researchers who study dowry-related deaths and violence have strongly implicated the joint family structure as one of the important familial contexts that perpetuate the use of violence against the woman (Bloch & Rao 1997, Narasimhan 2000, Vindhya 2000). Because dowry-related violence and deaths are much more likely to stem from high-control patriarchal

contexts, I anticipate that family structure is much more likely to be influential in intimate terrorism than in other types of violence.

Studies on coping mechanisms used by Indian women have tended to consider women's use of legal and formal institutions (Jaising 2001, Moore 1994). These studies document that women often use these services as a last resort. I anticipate that women use a wide range of informal sources of help before they approach formal institutions. In addition, researchers have also documented behaviors that can be classified as compliance and/or resistance behaviors in other contexts such as sexual trafficking and prostitution (Kempadoo 1998, Runyan 2000). Hence, these behaviors are also likely to be used in response to domestic violence as well. Given that there has been no extensive literature on the subject, the use of other coping behaviors is difficult to anticipate. However, these coping behaviors are likely to be different for different types of violence. If women are coping with high-control violence, they are likely to use very different coping styles as compared to women coping with low-control violence. But the manner in which these coping styles will differ in terms of the types of coping mechanisms cannot be anticipated.

Regional differences

One of the structural factors considered in this study is regional variability. While the pervasiveness of domestic violence goes unquestioned, the extent of the violence and the manifestation of the violence are different for different regions (Miller 1999). The research on the regions has usually concentrated on the north-south cultural dichotomy. While this comparison is useful, it does not recognize the diversity among areas within the north or the south. Thus, I will examine the differences among six regions in India. In my previous research on the subject (Menon, 2003) I found that regional differences are often an amalgamation of cultural structures that influence familial relationships, attitudes towards

women, and the status of women in the state. To assess the impact of these cultural influences, I hypothesize that there will be a considerable variability in the experience of domestic violence across regions.

Family characteristics

Religion: The variability reflected in region may be related to variations in religious affiliation. However, I cannot hypothesize specific effects of different religions on domestic violence for the DHS India or for my own fieldwork data. In the case of DHS India, the development of religion in each state is also different among regions (Ray 1999). Religious groups are more likely to adhere to the cultural norms of the region, rather than the general norms of their religion. For example, the religious practices of Muslims in Hyderabad (a southern city) are very different from the practices in Lucknow (a northern city). Moreover, there is only anecdotal evidence to suggest specific relationships between religion and likelihood of violence.

The only specific prediction that I can make, based on my previous experience with the data is that there will be a lower prevalence of violence amongst Buddhists and Jains. Since Buddhists and Jains in the country have historically endorsed non-violence in any aspect of their lives, including their eating and living habits, I argue that the propensity to hit is less likely amongst these populations. Because my primary data consists almost entirely of Hindus, no assessment can be made regarding the influence of religion in those data.

Family structure: Another structural factor that is of considerable importance is the structure of the family. The secondary dataset that I used in this study (Demographic Health Survey, 1999) provides limited opportunity for constructing the complex relationships that represent joint family systems. Therefore, I used an indirect measure (nuclear vs. non-nuclear family) to measure the effect of family structure on incidence of domestic violence. With

respect to the primary data, I have a direct measure of family structure, so the comparison categories are joint families and nuclear families. Based on previous research (Menon, 2003), I hypothesize that violence against women will be more pronounced in nuclear families compared to joint families. This is because joint families are much more likely to have stringent social control measures that minimize the need for using violence against women to control their actions.

Decision-making: Because violence is often used as a measure of last resort, I hypothesize for both the primary and secondary data that women are more likely to be beaten if they have greater autonomy in the household. In other words, I expect that if there are other members in the household who make decisions for the woman, she is much less likely to be abused.

Socio-economic Status: Research in India has documented that women from lower socio-economic status experience more physical violence than women from higher socio-economic status (Bhatti 1990, Visaria 1999). While non-physical forms of abuse are prevalent in higher socio-economic categories, reports of physical assault are substantially higher in the lower classes. The explanations for this pattern have been two-pronged. The family dynamics within the household are likely to be affected by the stress that financial burden induces. Therefore, violence is more likely in this volatile situation. The second reason for this trend can be the under reporting of violence from the middle-class and higher-class women, given the high stigma that is associated with violence in these socioeconomic classes. Hence, I hypothesize that reports of physical violence will be less likely for families with higher socio-economic status in both the primary data and secondary data analyses. In addition, I also argue that socioeconomic status of the family is likely to greatly influence women's coping methods.

Natal Family Violence: Apart from these factors, I also examine the women's history of abuse. Because marriages are usually endogamous in India, women are very likely to transfer to households similar to their own (Mahajan 1990b, Sengupta 1998). If the ideology of the threat of violence was present in her natal family, it is likely that the belief systems of the marital family are similar. Thus, if the woman experienced any physical assault in her natal home, chances are higher that she will experience physical assault from her husband. In addition, this experience of natal family violence as well as attitudes regarding domestic violence in the natal family are likely to greatly affect women's view of domestic violence, as well as their coping strategies. So, for example, if the natal family endorses domestic violence in certain situations, women are much less likely to approach the members of natal family for help in reducing their experience of domestic violence.

Individual characteristics

Education: One of the major predictors of domestic violence is education. The risk of being beaten is substantially reduced if the woman is educated (Duvvury et al. 2004, Visaria 1999). Many policy recommendations therefore concentrate on the education of women as a key factor in reducing violence (Ray, 1999). Thus, I propose that in both the primary and secondary data, women will report a lower incidence of violence if they are highly educated. In addition, they are much more likely to engage in more help-seeking behavior and contemplate legal action.

Labor Force Participation and Financial Independence: Labor force participation and financial independence are important factors influencing domestic violence and coping. I argue that the chances of experiencing abuse from their husband increase for working women since they are more likely to be outside the purview of social control by the family (Mencher 1989). In many parts of the world, work force participation does not

automatically make women financially independent. I propose that women's financial independence, apart from their labor force participation, will increase the incidence of violence. Participation in the labor force is likely to increase women's use of help-seeking behaviors and resistance behaviors. Because such women have access to social networks outside of the family, they are more likely to be able to use more active measures to address their experience of violence.

Attitudes towards Domestic Violence: There is considerable variability in Indian women's attitudes towards domestic violence. Some women believe that there are conditions under which a husband is justified in beating his wife. They do not consider such 'punishment' to be violent (ICRW, 2000). Therefore, I predict that attitudes endorsing the use of violence will be reflected in higher incidence of spousal violence.

Taking all of these factors into consideration will help me get a clear understanding of the specific contexts in which domestic violence takes place. This concentration on the specificity of contexts also allows for the recognition of the various ways in which women understand and respond to violence in their lives (McLeer 1998). We can thus address Mohanty's (2004) concern about "defining women as archetypal victims [freezing] them into 'objects-who-defend-themselves', [and] men into 'subjects-who-perpetrate-violence'..." (Mohanty 1984). If we need to debunk the notion that domestic violence stems solely from patriarchy; we must start examining the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence by taking into consideration the various interpersonal (or family) relationships that characterize this relationship. Thus, by conducting this research, I make a case for the importance of making distinctions in domestic violence and to explicate some of the contributions that such distinctions make to our understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence in India.

Women

We were read
 like the torn pages of children's notebooks
 made into cones to hold warm *chanajorgaram*
 We were looked at
 the way grumpily, you squint at your wristwatch
 after the alarm goes off in the morning.
 We were listened to
 distractedly
 the way film songs assail your ears
 spilling from cheap cassettes on a crowded bus
 They sensed us
 the way you sense the sufferings of a distant relative
 One day we said
 we're human too.
 Read us carefully
 one letter at a time
 they way after your BA, you'd read a job ad.
 Look at us
 the way, shivering,
 you'd gaze at the flames of a distant fire
 Listen to us
 as you would the unstruck music of the void
 and understand the way you'd understand a newly-learned language
 The moment they heard this
 from an invisible branch suspended in limbo
 like a swarm of gnats
 wild rumors went screeching
 "Women without character
 wild vines draining the sap
 from their hosts
 well-fed, bored with affluence
 these women
 pointlessly on edge
 indulging in the luxury of writing
 these stories and poems —
 not even their own,
 They said, amused.
 The rest of the stories dismissed with a wink

Anamika

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

My primary research objective is to bring clarity to the relationship between domestic violence and patriarchal structure across cultural and familial contexts in India, paying close attention to women's coping. I believe that this will expand our understanding of domestic violence beyond simplistic models of power, control, and patriarchal structure. This study is focused on four primary research questions:

1. What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence?
2. How do the diverse contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives?
3. What are the various coping strategies used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts?
4. How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?

In order to answer these questions in a more holistic manner, I employ a blended methodology of qualitative and quantitative research methods to create a data structure useful for identifying different types of control contexts in familial violence and the differential effects of these types of domestic violence.

This methodology includes a combination of primary and secondary data. For a short summary of the characteristics of the two datasets (Table 1). The secondary data for the project is taken from the Demographic Health Survey of India (DHS India) conducted in

1999. DHS India is an extremely useful and appropriate secondary data source for addressing the macro context of domestic violence. Its main objective was to obtain state-level and national-level information on various aspects of women's health, and it includes a number of questions on domestic violence experienced by women. Used in conjunction with the primary data, it creates a unique dataset that enables me to understand the macro- and micro- structures of domestic violence in India. In this study, I use the DHS primarily as a reference point to establish the influence of family and personal characteristics on the likelihood of experiencing domestic violence in India.

Table 1: Description of Datasets

<i>Data set characteristics</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
Sample size	75, 632 currently married women	80 ever married women
Sample sites	Data was collected from 26 states	Data was collected from 3 field sites
Sampling technique	Random, stratified sampling	Non-random, convenience sample
Questionnaires used	Household and Individual questionnaire	First structured interview, and Second semi-structured interview
Samples	All India sample	Somatne, Pimpri, and Corporation
Sample distribution	Proportional to the size of the state's rural and urban population	31% from Somatne 49% from Pimpri 20% from Corporation
Dependent variable	Ever hit by husband	Types of violence: Not violent, situational couple violence, and intimate terrorism

SECONDARY DATA SOURCE: DHS INDIA

The secondary dataset that I use in this dissertation is the Demographic Health Survey (DHS) for India conducted in 1999. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare selected the International Institute for Population Studies in Mumbai to conduct the second wave of the DHS, called the National Family Health Survey (DHS India), essentially a nation-wide survey of family health. The main objective of this survey is to obtain state-level and national-level information on various aspects of health such as fertility, family planning, nutrition of women and children, and quality of health and family welfare services. The DHS India was administered to a nationally representative samples of households, covering over 99% of India's population living in all 26 states. The overall target sample size of the survey is approximately 90,000 ever-married women between the ages of 15 to 49. The data were collected in two phases. Ten states were surveyed in the first phase and the remaining states were surveyed in the second phase. Information from individual states was also divided into two main stages. First, households were selected in all 26 states for the household questionnaire and then, based on the previously mentioned criteria women were selected from these households for the women's questionnaire.

The sample size for each state was determined by the target number of completed interviews with eligible women (DHS India 1998-1999). The sample size was set individually for each state depending on the resources available for the survey, the size of the state, and other demographic characteristics of the state such as its urban/rural population ratios. To a large extent, the population of the state determined the sample size of that state. The urban and rural samples were chosen separately. These samples were drawn proportionally to the to the size of the state's urban and rural population (DHS INDIA 1998-1999).

Sample Design

A uniform sample design was implemented in all the states. In each of the states, the rural sample was created first by selecting the Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) probability proportional to population size, and then randomly selecting nine households in each of the PSUs. In the urban areas, this process involved three steps. First, wards were selected proportional to population size sampling. Then one census enumeration block was randomly selected within each ward. Finally, households were randomly selected with each census enumeration block.

Sample selection in Rural Areas: The 1991 census list of villages was used as the sampling frame by which households were selected. There were several levels of stratification. The first level of stratification was geographic. Within the first level of stratification, villages were then divided using selected variables such as village size, percentage of the population belonging to scheduled-castes or scheduled-tribes (SC/ST), and female literacy. From the list of villages arranged according to the above criteria, villages were selected systematically with probability proportional to the 1991 census population of the villages. Villages were then proportionally distributed according to their size and households were selected within each of these villages with equal probability using systematic sampling. A minimum population of 50 households was required for a village to be included. On average, 30 households were targeted for interviews in each of the sampling units.

Sampling selection in Urban Areas: The 1991 census list of urban wards was used to guide the selection of sampling units. The urban wards were arranged according to districts by the level of female literacy in each of the districts and were selected systematically with probability proportional to population size. Then, one census enumeration block, which consisted of about 150-200 households was selected from each ward using proportional

population sampling and on average 30 households per census enumeration block were targeted for the household interviews.

Using these methods for the urban and rural samples, approximately 91,196 households were selected and 89,199 women were interviewed. The response rate for the household interviews is 94% and 96% for the individual interviews.

Questionnaires

The DHS survey for India uses three questionnaires – the household questionnaire, the woman’s questionnaire and the village questionnaire. The household questionnaire collected information from the head of the household and in the absence of the head of the household, from any other member of the family, on various characteristics of the health of all its members, such as the presence of asthma, tuberculosis, malaria etc. It also collected information on characteristics of the household such as number of members living in the household, religion of the family, ownership of property or house and other information. The responses to the household questions established household members’ eligibility for the women’s questionnaire.

All women in the household aged 15 through 49 who were currently married, formerly married, or widowed were interviewed using the women’s questionnaire. Eligible women from the households were asked about age, marital status, education, and employment status. The majority of the questions in the survey focused on the reproductive behavior of the women, addressing issues of use of contraception, sources of family planning, reproductive health, and knowledge of AIDS. As women’s reproductive health is closely related to their physical well-being, women were also asked about their experience of domestic violence in the household and their attitudes towards violence.

The village questionnaire collected information on the characteristics of the village, such as availability of amenities, literacy levels, and the implementation of development and welfare programs. As the information provided in the village questionnaire is not relevant to the study, I did not use it in my analyses.

MEASUREMENT OF QUANTITATIVE DATA: DHS India

Dependent Variable: Husband violence

I used two questions from DHS India to measure violence against women. The first question inquires if any persons have hit the respondent since she turned 15 years of age. If the respondents answered in the affirmative, they were then asked to identify all the individuals who had hit her. The answers to this question include members of the natal family, marital family, relatives as well as strangers. I coded women who were not hit by their husbands as 0, and those hit by their husbands as 1.

Independent Variables

Region: The Women's Questionnaire begins with preliminary questions regarding the place of residence of the respondent, including the state in which the respondent resides. Because data are available for 25 of the 26 states of India, comparing across individual states is cumbersome. Hence, I divided the states into six broad regions. The Northern region included Delhi, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Punjab, and Rajasthan. The Central region includes Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. Eastern consists of Bihar and West Bengal, and Northeast Region consists of seven regions, namely Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, and Sikkim. The Western Region consists of Goa, Gujarat, and Maharashtra, whereas the Southern Region consists of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, and Tamil Nadu. Both the Census of India and DHS India use these categories, which are based on the cultural, social, historical, and physical proximity of

the states within each regional category. A recent map of India illustrating the different states is provided below.



Family Characteristics

Religion: Because the women's questionnaire does not include a question that inquires about the religion of the women, I use the religion of the head of the household as a proxy for the religious belief of the respondent. The range of answers is Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, Buddhist/Neo Buddhist, Jain, Jewish, Zoroastrian/Parsi, No religion and Other. For the sake of simplicity, I recoded the variable to include only the major religious faiths (Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Buddhism, and Jainism) in my study. All other religious faiths form the category of Others.

Nuclear Family Structure: In the household questionnaire, there are a series of questions that inquire about the number of persons living in the household; their individual relationship to the head of the household; and the age, place of residence, literacy levels and marital status of each member of the family. The researchers working with the raw data recoded this information into a variable that describes the household structure of the family, focusing only on adults, which had separate categories for various living arrangements. Because the focus of this study is on women currently living with their husbands, I create the family structure variable out of this variable, but with only two categories— two adults, opposite sex and three + related adults.

According to this variable construction, a nuclear family is defined as a family structure that consists of the husband, wife and perhaps some children. A non-nuclear family consists of a husband, wife and other adults, which could include their adult children or other adults, any of whom may have families of their own living within the same household and extended family members of the head of the household. It must be acknowledged that the non-nuclear family structure does not *necessarily* represent a joint family system. Because the relationship between the three and more adults in the category of three+ related adults is not specified, I cannot be certain that this family structure functions like a joint family system. However, the presence of more family members in the household is likely to represent a joint family in a patriarchal society such as that of India.

Women's Autonomy: To measure women's autonomy in the household, the DHS India requests information about women's participation in making household decisions. Women are asked to identify the person making the decision regarding items to cook, obtaining healthcare for the respondent, purchasing jewelry and visits to the natal family. The choices are: respondent, husband, jointly with husband, others in the household, and jointly with

others in the household. In addition, I also examined whether the women were contributing to the household in any manner and whether they were in charge of decision-making regarding the money they earned. The question and answer format closely followed the one listed above. An additional question that I examined in relation to decision-making was regarding freedom of movement. The respondent was asked if she needed permission to visit relatives or go to the market. The respondent simply answered in the negative or in the affirmative.

Socio-economic Status of the Household: Being an agricultural country and with its economy not entirely based on cash, indices of socio-economic status cannot be based on solely on income levels of individuals. Therefore, I use the presence of basic amenities and possession of commodities in lieu of income levels. In the household questionnaire, inquiries were made by interviewers about consumer goods that the household possesses such as a mattress, a pressure cooker, an electric fan or a telephone etc. Additionally, the household questionnaire inquired about the use of amenities by the household and they are considered as indicators of the standard of living of the household. For example, households that use wood for fuel are less likely to be wealthy compared to households that have access to electricity. Similar questions such as source of drinking water and type of toilet facility are also included in the original questionnaire as an indication of socio-economic status.

Out of the various items, I identified a set of 15 indicators. The final variables selected are the use of electricity, radio, television, bicycle, motor cycle, mattress, cot/bed, table, clock/watch, pressure cooker, sewing machine, water pump, source of drinking water, type of toilet facility and main cooking fuel. I dichotomized the responses to indicate the presence or absence of consumer goods and amenities. Then I created a scale of socio-economic status by using a summation of the dichotomized variables. The range of the scale

is 0 to 15, with the lower numbers indicating lower socio-economic status (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.83).

Natal Family Violence: Natal family violence is the violence that is perpetrated by the mother, father, stepfather, stepmother, brother, or sister of the respondent. As mentioned before, women who were beaten after the age of 15 in the questionnaire were asked the identity of the perpetrator. Because women who were beaten by members of the natal family are identifiable, I construct a scale of natal family violence by taking by summarizing the responses for each of the relationships listed above. As the abuse by natal family members is coded as a scale variable, the potential range of the scale is from 0 to 6. The actual range of the scale is from 0 to 3. The lowest value, 0 indicates that no member of the natal family had abused the respondent and the highest value 3, indicates that three types of members of the natal family have beaten the respondent since the age of 15.

Personal Characteristics

Education: Education of the respondent is measured with various questions. Respondents were asked if they ever attended school, what was the highest grade they completed in school, and whether they could read or write. Researchers handling the raw data combined the answers to all the education questions into a number of simpler formats for easier investigation. Out of the many choices, I use the following variable with six categories for its ability to capture the variation in the sample. The six categories are higher secondary complete or more (equivalent to completing senior high school in the United States), high school complete (equivalent to completing sophomore year of high school in United States), middle school complete (equivalent to finishing eighth grade in United States), primary school complete (equivalent to finishing fifth grade in United States), literate, less than primary school complete, and illiterate.

Labor Force Participation: In the women's questionnaire, the working status of the respondent was addressed in a variety of questions. Women were asked if, aside from their housework, they were working. If they were working, then various questions about the nature of the work were asked, such as their occupation, whether they worked full time or periodically, whether they were paid in cash and other related questions. The questionnaire is rich in detail and although analyses of all of these factors may be useful in assessing the impact of labor force participation on the experience of violence, for the sake of brevity and simplicity, I analyzed only three critical aspects of working status.

First, women were asked whether they worked for family or outsiders. The options were whether women worked for the family farm, whether they worked for someone outside the family, or whether they were self-employed. Then, they were asked how often they worked in a year and the mode of payment for their labor force participation. The mode of payment included being paid in cash only, in cash and kind, in kind, or not being paid at all. With respect to regularity of work, women were asked whether they worked throughout the year, seasonally or part of the year, or once in a while.

Finally, I decided to choose the first indicator of women's labor force participation: whether they were self-employed or worked on a family farm or for someone else. This measure was chosen for two reasons. First, it is an indicator of autonomy of women's work. It also estimates the physical mobility of the women and interaction with the outside world. For example, women working for someone else are more likely to work outside the vicinity of their households, whereas women working on a family farm are more likely to interact with family members than others in the work environment.

Financial Independence: Financial independence of women is usually tied to their working status. However, in a patriarchal household, this relationship is not inevitable.

Women might be working full time, but not be in control of their own money. To capture this situation, I use the question that gauged the financial independence of all women, working and non-working. Women were asked whether they were allowed to have some money set aside to use as they wished. Women were asked to respond in a yes/no format.

One of the possible problems of using this question is that it does not give us any indication whether the woman controls the use of this financial resource for herself or for her family. It is quite possible that a woman's husband gives her some money for household expenditures about which she has enough discretion to respond affirmatively to the question. This use of money does not constitute financial independence on the part of the woman. However, given the lack of alternatives, and also the fact that this question was asked of both working and non-working women, I decided to include it in the analyses.

Attitudes towards domestic violence: In order to gauge whether women justify domestic violence, women were given various scenarios and then asked whether the use of violence was justified in each scenario. These included if the husband suspected her of being unfaithful, if her natal family did not give expected money, if she went out without telling him, if she was disrespectful to his parents, if she neglected the house or children or if she didn't cook food.

The women were asked to agree or disagree that violence was justified in each scenario and were also given the option of marking "I don't know" as an answer choice. I dichotomized the separate variables such that agreement would imply a more permissive attitude towards domestic violence. I summed all the responses and constructed it into a scale. The scale varied from 0 to 6 (Cronbachs' Alpha = .81). Low values indicate that women endorsed fewer statements, and higher values indicate that women endorsed more justifications for domestic violence.

While these secondary data are important for setting up the macro-social context, most of the answers to my dissertation questions come from the use of primary data that I collected in Pune, in India.

PRIMARY DATA COLLECTION: PUNE FIELDWORK

The primary data research methodology is heavily influenced by feminist methods and feminist methodology. A feminist analysis of domestic violence requires an understanding of the ways in which women make sense of their experiences of domestic violence and cope with it within the context of the particular family and other institutions in which they are situated (Thompson 1992, Wolf 1996). In order to capture the individual experiences of women in their specific economic and familial context, I make use of both quantitative as well as qualitative data.

The project required a diverse population with a multiplicity of family forms and family customs. Pune is particularly suited to the project because its growing population of 4.5 million people represents a multiplicity of caste, religious, cultural, linguistic, and family affiliations (Census, 2001). The diversity of the setting allows assessment of (a) the dynamics of domestic violence in the context of the different strategies used to control women in different family forms, and (b) the variety of ways in which women tap into their own individual cultural and family discourses to cope with violence in their homes.

For primary data collection, a sample of 80 women was selected with the help of two organizations, Maval Mahila Vikas Sanstha (MMVS), best translated as Maval Women's Empowerment Organization, and Shramik Mahila Morcha (SMM), best translated as Women Houseworkers' Union. Both of the organizations are located in Pune, a city located in the Southwestern part of India. This study required the availability of women's collectives or community action groups that offered access to individuals who were willing to talk about

domestic violence in the capacity of social workers, activists, and survivors of domestic violence. MMVS is a micro-credit group that works for the financial welfare of rural women in the village of Somatne and five neighboring villages. MMVS is located in a rural area approximately three hours away from the city of Pune by bus.

SMM is a domestic worker's union that was established in two places, one in central Pune, and the other in the industrialized city of Pimpri, approximately an hour away from Pune by bus. Thus, the field work sample consists of three primary samples, named after the location of the samples: the *Somatne Sample* provided by MMVS, the *Pimpri Sample* provided by the Pimpri office of SMM, and the *Pune Sample* provided by the Pune office of SMM. Along with my translator, Chitra Khare, I conducted structured and semi-structured interviews over a period of five months from February to May of 2006.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LOCATION

Maharashtra

The study sites (Pune and Pimpri-Chinwad) are located in Maharashtra (literally meaning Great Nation), India's third largest state in terms of area and second largest state in terms of population with approximately nine million individuals living in the state. The capital of Maharashtra is the city of Mumbai (formerly, Bombay), the largest city of India. While Marathi is the main language, because of the multi-cultural history of Mumbai and the booming Information Technology industry and other commercial industries in other parts of the state, Hindi, Gujarati, and English are also spoken, especially in Mumbai.

As in the larger national landscape, the state has a Hindu majority (80%), with minorities of Muslims (11%), Buddhists (6%), and Jains & Christians (1%). One of the primary reasons for the burgeoning population in the state is the favorable economics. In terms of the Gross National Product of the country, Maharashtra is the leading contributor,

producing 13% of the national industrial output. Despite this rather favorable ranking in the states, there are huge disparities within the state with regard to development, and socio-economic status of individuals.

Pune

Pune located approximately 150 kilometers southeast of Mumbai. It is the eighth largest city of India, with a population of 4.6 million people. Pune is the educational capital of India hosting the majority of esteemed colleges and educational institutions, and is often referred to as the “Oxford of the East”. Presently, it is also home to many software companies after the expansion in the information technology industry in India.

Demographically speaking, Pune is considerably less diverse than Mumbai and is considered the main cultural capital of Marathi-speaking individuals. However, with the recent boom in the information technology industry and automobile industry, it has seen a tremendous increase in the development of suburbs. This increase the diversity of Pune due to an influx of skilled and unskilled laborers from other parts of the country. The urban city limits have also expanded tremendously to include the neighboring city of Pimpri-Chinchwad (otherwise known as Pimpri), the industrial twin city of Pune.

Pimpri-Chinchwad

Pimpri-Chinchwad (hereby referred to as Pimpri) is historically an industrial town hosting India’s major automobile industries such as Bajaj Auto, Telco, Kinetic and Bajaj Tempo. It is also the home of several metal industries as well as India’s premier antibiotics research institute. While moving away from its industrial roots into the status of a twin city of Pune, Pimpri has not achieved the cultural or cosmopolitan status as its twin city has. With a population of less than a million people, it largely remains an industrial city with suburbs that are built around the industries.

SAMPLE DESIGN: PUNE FIELDWORK

The fieldwork sample consists of three primary samples, named after the location of the samples: the *Somatne Sample* provided by MMVS, the *Pimpri Sample* provided by the Pimpri office of SMM, and the *Corporation Sample* provided by the Pune office of SMM. The goal of the sampling plan was to access two major groups:

Known Survivors: The caseworkers of MMVS and SMM made the initial contact with known survivors of domestic violence. The caseworkers identified individuals who had either recently or previously approached the organization for help to solve domestic disputes. The caseworkers were instructed to tell these known survivors that the study was about marital relationships (and not of violence), that the participation was strictly voluntary and that services from the organizations would not be denied if the woman did not want to participate. In addition, I also assured my participations about the confidentiality of the data. No identifiers were collected from the respondents, and the names were collected only for the consent forms. These consent forms listing names were kept separate from the questionnaire, and the consent forms were destroyed after the research study was completed. This created a non-random convenience sample of women who had experienced domestic abuse and sought help (n=19).

General Sample: The general sample is a sample of families who had not approached the organization with respect to domestic abuse. This sample is recruited either through the recommendations of the known survivors sample or through the informal social networks of the organization. While some of the women from the general sample did know that the interview was about violence (especially if they had been recommended by a known survivor), I emphasized in my introduction that the study was about marital relationships. Anonymity and confidentiality was emphasized in this introduction. This sample was a

snowball sample that was linked to the Known Survivors sample and to the caseworkers of the organization. It was expected to consist primarily of non-violent couples (n=61).

In sum, the study sample consists of three groups: (1) women who experienced violence and decided to use the help of formal organizations such as MMVS and SMM; (2) women who experienced violence, but did not report to any organization and did not seek any help from the organization regarding domestic violence, and (3) women who had not experienced violence, and had come to the organizations for matters that were unrelated to the marital relationship. Because the two organizations that I was working with were not focused centrally on domestic violence, given one was a micro-credit union and the other was a labor union, the women who came to the organizations were not necessarily seeking remedy for their marital problems. The majority of the complaints had to do with legal matters related to employment.

The reasons for the collection of information from the general sample are two-fold. Firstly, women who take the help of agencies are likely to have experienced different kinds of violence than have women who do not access agencies (for further elaboration, see Johnson [1995]) Secondly, women who access the help of institutions are more likely to be differently placed based on their individual access to familial, financial or emotional resources, compared to women who did not have access to these institutional resources of help. Therefore, inclusion of this general sample allows us access to forms of control, violence, and coping that are not accessible with the known survivors sample. Also, given the relatively high acceptability of violence in Indian society, I wanted to examine the nature of the violent relationship that generally does not get reported to formal agencies or networks.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Although the sample selection from the three field sites was very different, they were mostly divided into two sub-samples: Known Survivors and General Sample. The Known Survivors of the *Somatne sample* were summoned by the caseworkers explicitly to participate in the study (n=10). The second sub-sample consisted of General Sample women who were involved in four self-help groups, who were recruited for the study by one of the caseworkers (n=15).

The Known Survivor sample in the *Pimpri sample* was also recruited by the main caseworker in the region to participate in the interview (n=6). The General Sample women came to the interviews primarily for compensation, which acted as an incentive to participate in the interview (n=33). The women in the *Corporation sample* mainly consisted of women who had approached the organization for the sole purpose of seeking help regarding domestic violence (n=13). We were not able to interview many women in the General Sample at this site (n=3).

QUANTITATIVE SURVEYS AND QUALITATIVE SURVEYS IN PUNE

The quantitative studies of domestic violence in the DHS did not contain any questions about the control contexts that are central to the dissertation. This is primarily because the DHS is a health survey, and they include measurements of domestic violence in context of these health variables. Usually, quantitative studies on domestic violence are often based on questionnaires, which contain measurements of domestic violence and control. The most popular amongst these scales is the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS). However, this scale does not provide power and control information. Although the CTS is a problematic scale, it is used as a starting point in creating the questionnaire that addresses violent

behaviors in a relationship. Copies of the first and second interview questionnaires are included in Appendix A.

Marital Control: Control items came primarily from the National Violence against Women survey (NVAW), items that were also used in the national Canadian survey of domestic violence, and that were used by Johnson and Leone (2005) to differentiate among types of domestic violence. I asked women to report how often their husband (1) tries to limit contact with friends and family, (2) is jealous or possessive, (3) insists on knowing their whereabouts, (4) makes them feel inadequate, (5) shouts or swears at them (6) insults them in front of others, and (7) prevents access to money. Women were asked to rate their responses on a 4-point scale that ranged from never to often.

Marital Quality: I asked women details about the marital arrangement, the nature of marital quality, the source of disagreements, and the respondent's feelings about the marriage. In order to take into consideration both the family structure of the marital and natal household and sources of support that women might have in the event of domestic violence, I asked whether respondents would characterize their marriage as arranged, love (with and without their parents consent), or love/arranged (with and without their parents consent). I also asked the women if they disagree with their husbands on various matters such as household tasks, expenditures, labor force participation, etc. Women were asked to rate the level of disagreement on a 4-point scale that ranged from 'never' to 'often.' Additionally, on the same 4-point scale, I asked them if they regretted marrying their husband, if they had ever left their house because of an argument, and if they thought the marital relationship was going well.

Husband's income and distribution of income: I included five measures regarding the distribution of income earned by both the husband and the respondent. I asked respondents

what husbands did with the income that they earned. Response options ranged from giving the entire or some of the amount to his wife, to keeping the entire amount for himself. The same question was also asked for the distribution of the respondent's earnings. Women were also asked to identify individuals who were responsible for the expenditure of the income earned by her husband, and the income earned by the respondent. The choices given to them were the same as the DHS, for easy comparability. Also, women were asked how much their husband's earnings as well as their own contributed to the household.

Decision making: Additional measures relating to decision making regarding children were included in this section. In addition to identifying the individuals responsible for the decisions relating to cooking, healthcare, purchase of important articles in the household, women were also asked to identify the individuals responsible for the children's schooling, purchase of clothes, discipline, and children's healthcare. I asked women if they needed permission to spend a social evening with relatives, neighbors, people she worked with, and whether she need permission to go to work, school, or to the hospital.

Violence: In addition to the variables included in the DHS, I asked specific questions about the violence that women experienced. Some of the questions were related to alcohol consumption during the assault, and others were about specific acts of violence. I asked them whether their husband had ever pushed, shoved, slapped, punched, or choked them, with response options including never, once, twice, 3 or 5 times, 6 to 10 times, 11 to 20 times, or more than 20 times. The alcohol related questions asked women whether they were most likely to be beaten when their husbands were drunk, and how often their husbands were drunk when they beat them. There was also an additional question to ask whether the violence that was used against them was justified or not. The women could answer either in the affirmative or in the negative.

Coping Mechanisms: The first section on coping is focused on women's help seeking behavior. They were asked whether they had told anyone about the violence, and if they had, I asked them to identify the individual. If women did not tell anyone or did not seek help of any kind, I also asked them the reason they didn't.

The other parts of this section were related to the reactions of the women after the violence. Women were asked if they had taken the support (emotional or financial) of their relatives, friends, neighbors, police, or social workers. In addition, they were asked if these aforementioned individuals or institutions gave them help of their own accord. Additional questions were also framed to ask whether the help had been useful.

The women were also asked what they did after an episode of violence, such as whether they complied with everything, whether they withheld sex or affection, or whether they fought back. Women could answer either in the affirmative or negative. Close-ended questions were also asked about husband's reaction after the violence.

At the end of this section, I asked open-ended questions about the specific reasons that women were given by their husbands to explain the violence. The follow-up questions related to whether women believed that this was the 'real' reason that they were being beaten and what they thought was the 'real' reason for their experience of violence.

The addition of these measures to the original DHS questions created two data collection instruments: (1) a short, structured questionnaire designed to identify domestic violence and various coping mechanisms, and (2) a semi-structured, open-ended questionnaire that was used to record more detailed narratives about violence and coping. Both the questionnaires were first composed in English, and then with the help of Chitra Khare, translated into Marathi.

THE PROCESS OF DATA COLLECTION

The data collection process consisted of two personal interviews, the first of which took approximately half an hour and the second, a little over an hour. The first interview was a structured questionnaire containing approximately 80 short questions. It recorded basic demographic characteristics (age, education, labor force participation,), marital quality (happiness of marriage, decision-making in the household), nature of violence (longevity of violence, injuries sustained), and coping strategies (help seeking, compliance, or defiance behaviors)..

The second interview was a semi-structured interview asking more open-ended questions about the patterns of control and violence experienced by women. For example, in this section, I recorded narratives regarding the frequency of violence, how it fits with the general control structure of the family, immediate reactions to violence, and strategies used for ending violence. This second interview provides information about the specific contexts in which violence takes place, and also the ‘cultural’ and ‘patriarchal’ explanations that are often applied to violent incidents.

After the first interview was finished, I asked women who had experienced violence to come back to the second interview. If they consented, I arranged for a day that was convenient for both parties, and conducted the interviews in the same location. Twenty women consented to being interviewed the second time. While the questionnaires were available in both Marathi and English, we used the Marathi version most often.

Because the resources and time that the organizations could give us were very limited, Chitra and I visited each of the field sites once a week for a day. We set up a specific day for each organization so that arrangements could be made to recruit women for that particular day. Hence, depending on the success of the recruitment efforts on the part of the

organization or some of the respondents, I interviewed approximately six women per visit, although the rate of recruitment varied over time – from about three interviews a week to 28 interviews a week.

I recorded all the interviews on an electronic recorder, after getting the consent of women. Because I am not fluent in Marathi (the native language of most of my respondents), I conducted all the interviews with the help of my translator, Chitra Khare. She was also responsible for transcribing all the recorded conversations. I hired Hema Honwad to translate the transcribed interviews into English. I entered the quantitative data into a dataset in SPSS, and coded the qualitative interview transcripts into N*udist (a qualitative software package). Taken together, the quantitative and qualitative data from DHS India and my fieldwork answer the four questions of my dissertation.

Insignia of Blood

Man, I've never raised my arms against you

Slitting the hair-parting the day you drew the insignia of blood
I felt pain, I didn't tell you

On dry soil no rose blooms, no peacock dances
Yet digging the sandy terrain we drew water
With son on the lap have watched glow-worms, pointed out Orion.

We know earth is woman, the sky primal man
Then why have you chained my arms?
Why didn't you let me see the sun for a thousand years?

Don't insult the earth that holds you
Man, I've never raised my arms against you.

Mallika Sengupta

Chapter 4

DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND CONTROL IN INDIA **Quantitative analyses from secondary and primary data**

One of the primary goals of this dissertation is to assess the different types of domestic violence in India, taking into consideration the familial and marital context within which the violence takes place. In order to do this, I examine the effect that regional, familial, and individual characteristics of women have on the likelihood of experiencing domestic violence using DHS India. The DHS India is useful for examining the relationship of domestic violence to a number of contextual and individual factors such as socioeconomic status, education, labor force participation, and decision-making in the household. However, it does not allow for the differentiation of types of violence nor does it provide information regarding control or coping. For this, I turn to my primary data where, using the control measures in the quantitative section of my primary data, I can distinguish between the types of domestic violence that Indian women experience.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DHS SAMPLE USED IN THE STUDY

DHS India

Demographic characteristics: Most of the women in the DHS India sample were young, with average age of the sample being 32 years. Seventy eight percent of the DHS India sample was Hindu, and 12 percent Muslim (see Table 2). The rest of the women were Christian, Sikh, or Buddhist (6%, 2% and 1%, respectively). Most of the sample was rural (69.1%). In general, women who were interviewed for the individual questionnaires were wives of the head of the household. The other prominent respondents were the daughter-in-law of the head of the household (22%). While the sample includes a few heads of the household, daughters, granddaughters, and mothers, the majority of the sample consists of

wives and daughter-in-laws of the head of the household (not shown). The average number of household members, including children, is approximately six members. There is great diversity with respect to the number household members, with some families containing only two household members (3%), while a small minority of families (.001%, not shown here) having over 30 members in the household.

The socio-economic scale that I constructed for this study (from 15 basic amenities and commodities) indicates that while the average household has at least seven basic amenities and commodities, the sample is skewed slightly towards the lower end of the economic scale. Almost 50% of the DHS India households use or possess fewer than five basic amenities and commodities. Towards the higher end, only 0.2% of the sample has all 15 basic amenities and commodities. This pattern of concentration of households in the lower end and few households in the higher end is typical of the income distributions in most developing countries.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics: Demographic and family variables

<i>Sample characteristics</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
Age (average years)	31.5	32.1
Religion (% Hindu)	77.8	77.5
Social habitat (% urban)	31.9	31.3
Number of household members (average number)	6.6	6.3
Relationship to head of the household (% wife)	72.1	80.0
SES (average, scale from 0 to 15)	6.5	7.2
Family structure (% nuclear)	30.9	36.3
Total number of cases	75632	80

Family characteristics: I found that 69% of the families in the sample (n=75,632) lived in non-nuclear family settings, while 31% of the households in DHS India lived in nuclear family settings (see Table 2). Decisions regarding obtaining healthcare, purchasing jewelry, and staying with relatives are made by the husband in approximately 40% of the households

(see Table 3.1 and 3.2). In approximately 25 to 37% of the households, decisions regarding healthcare, jewelry, and visiting relatives are made jointly by husbands and wives. The majority of the women have to ask permission to go to the market (75%) or to visit relatives (65%). Hence, while women might not be completely prohibited from doing either of the two, there is some social control on women's movements outside the household.

Table 3.1. Descriptive statistics: Decision-making in the household

<i>Decision-making in the household</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
To cook?	%	%
Respondent	72.3	52.5
Husband	4.1	7.5
Jointly with husband	4.9	2.5
Others	8.9	25.0
Jointly with others	9.8	6.3
To obtain healthcare?		
Respondent	25.8	28.8
Husband	41.1	30.0
Jointly with husband	20.2	10.0
Others	6.7	11.3
Jointly with others	6.3	6.3
To purchase jewelry?		
Respondent	7.1	21.3
Husband	34.8	12.5
Jointly with husband	36.9	18.8
Others	10.2	8.8
Jointly with others	11.0	1.3
About staying with family?	%	%
Respondent	9.8	21.3
Husband	41.5	11.3
Jointly with husband	30.4	37.5
Others	9.0	3.8
Jointly with others	9.2	5.0
Total	75632	80

Individual characteristics: The levels of education among the women are low (see Table 3.3).

About half of the sample is illiterate and only 14% of the sample has completed five years of schooling (not shown). The labor force participation of women is also low. Sixty-three percent of the women identify themselves as non-working. While 15% of the women work

on their family farms, 17% work for someone other than their families. Women who are self-employed form approximately 5% of the sample. These numbers are an under-estimation of women's participation in the work force, because many women engage in agricultural tasks that are considered to be part of their household chores (Deshpande 2001).

Table 3.2. Descriptive statistics: Decision-making in the household (continued)

<i>Decision-making in the household</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
Do you need permission to		
Visit relatives?		
No	23.9	35.0
Yes	74.8	45.0
Not allowed to go	1.2	11.3
Go to market?		
No	31.2	41.3
Yes	64.1	33.8
Not allowed to go	4.6	11.3
Total	75632	80

More than half of the women in the sample are allowed to have money set aside for themselves (60%, in Table 3.3). It is not clear whether this money is used for individual use, or towards feeding, clothing and running the household. Some researchers argue that typically women's earnings are not considered to be their personal financial resource, and are often used for household expenses. But given our interest in women's access to money, this measure of financial independence is useful for our analyses.

Approximately half of the women in the sample do not endorse any of the six justifications for domestic violence. Further breakdown of this measure indicates that 55% of the women do accept at least one justification for wife battery, and 3% of the population accepts all six justifications for violence (not shown here).

Table 3.3. Descriptive statistics: Education, employment and attitudinal characteristics

<i>Sample characteristics</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
Education (% illiterate)	54.4	30.0
Labor force participation (% working)	36.4	65.0
Current employer (%)		
Selling things		1.3
Self-employed	5.1	7.5
For someone else	16.7	46.3
For family member	14.6	6.3
Allowed to have money set aside (% Yes)	59.9	76.3
Attitudes towards domestic violence (average, scale from 0 to 6)	1.64	3.25
Total	75632	80

Experience of violence: Very few of the women in the sample reported been beaten by any member of their natal family (3%). With respect to their experience of domestic violence in their marital homes, 17% of the women had been beaten by their husbands, and 1.5% of the women had been beaten by a member of the marital family (see Table 4). Women were asked how frequently they were beaten in the last year. The responses were: not beaten, once, a few times, many times. Out of these measures, I constructed a severity scale from 0 to 4, indicating the frequency of violence with lower numbers indicating lower levels of domestic violence.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics: Domestic/Family violence

<i>Sample characteristics</i>	<i>DHS India</i>	<i>Fieldwork</i>
Hit by Husband	16.6	52.5
Hit by natal family (% Hit)	2.8	0.0
Hit by marital family (% Hit)	1.5	10.0
Hit by children (% Hit)	0.1	0.0
Hit by ex-husband (% Hit)	0.2	0.0
Severity of violence (average, on a scale from 0 to 4 for DHS, and 0 to 10 for Fieldwork)	2.91	2.90
Husband drunk when beating (% yes)		28.8
Total	75632	80

STRUCTURAL CONTEXTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

One of the primary reasons for using DHS in this dissertation is to understand the influence of regional variation, family characteristics, and individual characteristics of women on their experience of violence. In order to simplify the analysis, I examined only the violence that women experienced if they are currently married and living with their husband. Another restriction of this sample is that because DHS India is primarily a health survey, only women who were in their years of fertility were interviewed (15-49 years).

In order to bring clarity to the different analyses performed to assess the influence of regional, family and individual characteristics, I first look at the bivariate relationships between each independent variable and the likelihood of being hit by one's husband. The coefficients in Column 1 of Table 5 are bivariate odds ratios. Columns 2-3 of the same table present multivariate analyses for two sets of independent variables (family characteristics and individual characteristics), and column 4 presents the multivariate analysis using all of the independent variables.

Predicting violence based on regional differences.

The bivariate results in Column 1 of Table 5 indicate that there is considerable variability with respect to region. The odds that a woman is beaten by her husband are 2.26 times higher if she comes from the central part of the country than they are if she lives in the north, and 2.38 times higher if she is a resident of the eastern part of the country. In addition, the odds of being beaten in the south are more than twice the odds of being beaten in the north (2.54). The results of the multivariate analysis in Column 4 indicate that these patterns are somewhat reduced when controlling for other variables, but the pattern remains basically the same.

One of the striking aspects of these regional patterns, given that women in the south have enjoyed generally high status compared to other regions of the country (Bloch & Rao 1997, Mencher 1989, Miller 1999), is that women in the Southern regions are more likely to be hit than those in the north. This pattern fits with Jackman's argument that violence is used primarily as a means of getting back control, and that if other means of control are effective, violence is unnecessary (Jackman 1994, Menon 2003).

Predicting violence based on family characteristics

Religion: Bivariate analyses reveal that there are tremendous effects of religion on the odds that a woman will be beaten by her husband (see Column 1, Table 5). Except for Muslims (odds ratio = 1.10), women from all other religions seem to fare considerably better than Hindu women. For example, if the woman's family is Christian by faith, the odds of being beaten are clearly lower than those for a Hindu woman (odds ratio of .59), and even lower if she practices Buddhism or Jainism (odds ratios of .509 and .214 respectively). These effects of religion become slightly stronger and in the case of Sikh women, change direction, when we control for other family characteristics and individual characteristics. For example, the odds ratio of experiencing violence for Sikh women is 0.59 when compared to Hindu women.

When controlling for other family characteristics such as socioeconomic status, family structure, and for other personal characteristics such as education, labor force participation and attitudes towards domestic violence, Sikh women are *more* likely to experience domestic violence compared to Hindu women (odds ratio changes from 0.59 to 1.19 to 1.75 from column 2 to 4). Sikh women are commonly depicted as very strong women. At the same time, the women within the Sikh family are often devalued as indicated by the strong son preference in Sikh culture. So, without further investigation of the specific

mechanism through which the Sikh religion translates into high rates of domestic violence, the reasons for this particular finding are subject to speculation.

Rural or Urban: The odds of being beaten for women living in the rural areas are much greater than women living in the urban areas (odds ratio= 1.62, see Column 1, Table 5). However controlling for other family characteristics, this effect disappears completely (odds ratio = 0.95, see Column 2, Table 5). After controlling for family and individual characteristics, there is an effect of social habitat, but it is in the opposite direction (odds ratio=0.85, see Column 4, Table 5). Thus, it appears that if we control for education, labor force participation, and other individual characteristics, women in the rural areas are less likely to experience violence than urban women.

Socio-economic status: Economic status consistently correlates with domestic violence in other studies. Whether related to dowry or not, studies have indicated that the prevalence of violence is highest among groups that are either very poor or desire social mobility (Ganesh 1989, Goody & Tambiah 1973). The analyses indicate that for every unit increase in the possession of basic amenities or commodities, the odds of being beaten by one's husband are reduced by a factor of 0.86. This effect remains essentially the same after controlling for family and individual characteristics (odds ratio = 0.87 in Column 2, and 0.95 in Column 4).

Role of the family: The family provides both ideological and material bases for the systematic subjugation of women, so it is important to understand the role of the family in explaining family-based violence against women. The three family characteristics discussed below are indirect indicators of the 'jointness' of family.

Table 5: Logistic regressions predicting domestic violence

	<i>Bivariate Odds Ratios</i>	<i>Hit by Husband</i>		
		2	3	4
<i>Region</i>				
North	-			-
Central	2.26**			1.63**
East	2.38**			1.91**
North East	1.07			0.88*
West	1.14*			0.95
South	2.54**			1.85**
<i>Religion</i>				
Hindu	-	-		-
Muslim	1.10**	1.14**		1.15**
Christian	0.59**	0.62**		0.72**
Sikh	0.59**	1.19*		1.75**
Buddhist	0.51**	0.56**		0.79
Jain	0.21**	0.43**		0.64
Others	1.05	0.95		1.29*
<i>Social habitat</i>				
Urban	-	-		-
Rural	1.62**	0.95		0.85**
<i>Socioeconomic status</i>				
	0.86**	0.87**		0.95**
<i>Family Structure</i>				
Nuclear	-	-		-
Non-Nuclear	0.69**	0.90**		0.82**
<i>Decision to purchase jewelry</i>				
Respondent	-	-		-
Husband	0.86**	0.76**		0.79**
Jointly with husband	0.61**	0.74**		0.70**
Others	0.51**	0.68**		0.59**
Jointly with Others	0.39**	0.63**		0.57**
<i>Permission needed to go to the market</i>				
No permission needed	-	-		-
Permission needed	1.09**	0.91**		0.89**
Not allowed to go	1.40**	1.12		0.96
<i>Natal family violence</i>				
	1.85**	1.99**		2.00**

Table 5: Logistic regressions predicting domestic violence (continued)

	<i>Bivariate Odds Ratios</i>	<i>Hit by Husband</i>		
		2	3	4
<i>Formal education</i>				
Illiterate	-	-	-	-
< Primary School Complete	0.69**	0.75**	0.84**	
Primary School Complete (0 – 5)	0.58**	0.67**	0.78**	
Middle School Complete (6 – 8)	0.42**	0.51**	0.66**	
High School Complete (9 – 10)	0.25**	0.31**	0.43**	
Higher Secondary Complete (+ 2)	0.10**	0.13**	0.29**	
<i>Current employer</i>				
Not working	-	-	-	
Self employed	1.58**	1.50	1.43**	
For someone else	2.32**	1.47**	1.63**	
For family member	1.61**	1.33	1.28	
<i>Allowed to have money set aside</i>				
No	-	-	-	
Yes	0.79**	0.95	0.99	
<i>Attitudes towards domestic violence</i>	1.22**	1.15**	1.15**	
Constant				0.28

Note. This table examines the bivariate and multivariate effects of regional differences, family characteristics, and individual characteristics, when used as predictors of the dependent variable, *Hit by Husband*. e^B = exponentiated B is the odds ratio. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Family structure: At the zero order, the odds of being beaten for women living in non-nuclear setting are actually less than those of women living in a nuclear household (odds ratio = 0.69, see Table 5, Column 1). After controlling for family characteristics as well as individual characteristics, they change slightly (odds ratio = 0.90 in Column 2, and odds ratio = 0.82 in Column 3, see Table 5). This finding, as we have stated earlier, is counter-intuitive considering the volume of research on domestic violence that indicates that family members, particularly female kin of the husband's family, play an active role in the violence perpetrated by husbands (Madan 1975, Madhurima 1996, Mahajan 1990, Martin 1999, Rao et al. 2000,

Singh & Unnithan 1999). I interpret these findings in the light of an earlier study that indicated that when social control is effective through non-violent means, then violence becomes unnecessary (Jackman 1994).

Decision-making: Another indirect indicator of “jointness” of the family is the manner in which women contribute to the decision-making process of the household. Because the owner of jewelry in an Indian household is identifiable, I hypothesize that the possession and purchase of jewelry gives women ownership and a modicum of control over that resource (Leonard 1979). Jewelry is a piece of property that women can claim rights to and the decision-making process for purchasing such a valuable resource is indicative of women’s position and autonomy in the household.

There is a systematic reduction of odds of being beaten when decisions are made by persons other than the respondent. When the husband makes the decision, the odds ratio is 0.867 and when the decision is made jointly with others, the odds ratio is 0.387. Hence, women are much less likely to experience violence if they make the decision jointly with their husbands or with others, but are most likely to experience violence they are the sole decision-makers. The results of the multivariate analysis in Column 3 and 4 indicate that these patterns are somewhat reduced when controlling for other variables, but still remain the same. Again, the results can be interpreted in terms of Jackman (1994)’s reflections on paternalism which indicate that when women are effectively controlled by other means, the use of physical violence to restrict them is reduced.

Physical mobility: Another dimension of household dynamic is freedom of movement. Women were asked if they need permission to go to the market. I find that women are at a greater risk of being hit by their husbands if they are not allowed to go to the market (odds ratio=1.402) or if they need permission to go (odds ratio = 1.09). After

controlling for family and individual characteristics, we find that some of these effects disappear (Column 2 and 4 in Table 5). However, women who need permission to go to the market are still less likely to experience violence than women who don't need permission, even after controlling for family and individual characteristics (odds ratio = 0.91 in Column 2, odds ratio of 0.89 in Column 4 in Table 5).

Women who need permission are less likely to be assaulted compared to women who do not need permission. Yet, women who are heavily restricted experience similar levels of violence as compared to women who are not restricted at all. These anomalous findings indicate that the dynamics of the family relating to physical mobility shares a complicated relationship with domestic violence. These dynamics can be clearer if the specific control contexts of the family system are taken into consideration. For example, it is possible that women who are not allowed to go are reporting high control violence, whereas the women who do not need permission to travel experience low control violence. Given the limited information in the DHS, we can explore this question further in our qualitative analyses.

Natal family violence: Natal and marital families often share the same belief systems regarding the use of violence against their daughters and wives. At the zero order, natal family violence has a strong relationship with likelihood of being beaten by one's husband. For each additional type of natal family member who had beaten the respondent, the odds of being beaten by one's husband increases by a factor of 1.85 (see Column 1 in Table 5). These effects remain strong after controlling for family characteristics (odds ratio = 1.99, Column 2), and personal characteristics (odds ratio = 2.00, Column 4 in Table 5).

Predicting violence based on individual characteristics

Education: The zero order relationship between education and domestic violence reveals that the odds of experiencing domestic violence decline regularly with each increase

in the level of education (see Column 1 in Table 5). The odds of being beaten for women who have completed higher secondary or more are one-tenth of the odds for illiterate women. These patterns hold even after controlling for family characteristics and personal characteristics (Column 3 and 4, in Table 5).

Labor force participation: Researchers argue that women who work outside their homes tend to seek help and deal with a violent situation better than non-working women (Kaushik 1990, Kishwar 1999, Leonard 1979, Macmillan & Gartner 1999). For example, they are more likely to be in interaction with individuals other than the members of the household. However, in this context interaction outside the household is likely to be influenced by the forms of employment that the women are engaged in. For example, if a woman is working on her family farm, she is less likely to interact with the world outside of her household compared to a regular paid employee who works outside the homestead. I found that more women report being abused if the employer is someone that is not part of the family household (odds ratio = 2.32) compared to women who do not work at all.

In general, working outside the home seems to increase the likelihood of being beaten. The degrees to which women interact with their outside working environment seem to increase the chances that they will be assaulted by their husbands. After controlling for family and personal characteristics, I found that women who work in the family farm do not differ in their experience of violence from women who do not work. However, women who work for someone else or are self employed are more likely to experience violence from their husbands compared to women who are not working after controlling for family and individual characteristics (odds ratio = 1.63 and 1.43, respectively in Column 4 in Table 5).

Financial independence: As mentioned before, labor force participation of women does not necessarily translate to financial independence. We find the odds that women who were

allowed to have money set aside would be beaten are less than those of women who do not have that independence (odds ratio of 0.79). However, these effects disappear completely after controlling for family and individual characteristics.

Respondent's attitudes towards domestic violence: At the zero order, each unit increase in the acceptance of justifications for violence increases the odds ratio of being beaten by one's partner by a factor of 1.22. Although the effect reduces slightly to 1.15 after controlling for family and individual characteristics, it seems that women who justify the use of domestic violence are more likely to have experienced domestic violence.

Summary of DHS India analyses:

These analyses document regional differences in the reports of domestic violence in India. While some of this diversity is explained through the addition of family characteristics (religion, family structure, decision-making, socio-economic status and natal family violence) and individual characteristics (education, labor force participation, financial independence, and attitudes towards domestic violence), the regional differences are still strong. Women from the 'liberal' South are much more likely to be beaten by their husbands than their counterparts in the more 'patriarchal' North.

The presence of family characteristics indicating 'jointness' (non-nuclear family structure, and decision-making shared with people other than the husband) shows a counter-intuitive trend: husbands are less likely to beat their wives in joint families than non-joint families. For example, women were less likely to be victimized by violence if they were not in control of decision-making of the household. So, when women are more controlled by structural forces, they are less likely to be beaten.

Another important finding is the increased likelihood of women being beaten if they are employed. Women who work are assumed to have more freedom of movement than

women who do not work. Not only do they earn money for their household, they are also more capable of functioning in the world outside of the household. Nevertheless, the risk of being beaten is high for any woman who works, especially high for women who work for someone other than family. It has been documented in several cases that *because* women acquire freedom of movement and are at times outside the ideological control and role expectations of the family, they are more likely to be beaten (Madhurima 1996) The independence of these women is seen as a threat to the authority of the family and thus, violence is used against them to control them (Bhatti 1990, Miller 1999).

All of these findings suggest a general elaboration of the feminist analyses of motivations for domestic violence. Feminists have argued that family violence is about power and that violence against women in the family is usually used to gain control over “our women.” Given this premise, I contend that when power is concentrated along patriarchal lines, the likelihood of using violence is reduced considerably because the power structure effectively imposes cultural, social, and physical restrictions on women. In such situations, because the structural control over women is already established, the use of violence is redundant.

Finally, it should be stressed that while the effects of family form on husband-to-wife violence is a significant finding, there is much left to be explained. The Nagelkerk R-square is only 11.7% of the total variation and it gives us an indication that there are many factors that explain the prevalence of domestic violence that remain untapped by this model. This suggests that we need to examine the effect of structural context on prevalence of domestic violence in a more nuanced manner.

DESCRIPTION OF FIELDWORK IN PUNE

While the DHS has given us an excellent idea about the structural context of domestic violence in India, it has some limitations on the kinds of information it can give us. In particular, there is no information on means of coercive control other than violence, and there is no information on women's strategies for dealing with violence from their husbands. To remedy this problem, I included questions about coercive control and coping in my fieldwork surveys.

Most of my fieldwork data come from the Pimpri Sample (49%), followed by Somatne Sample (31%), and Corporation Sample (20%) (see Table 1 in Chapter 3). Consequently, most of the sample comes from urban sites (69%). I interviewed 80 women whose ages ranged from 18 to 60 years (see Table 1). Approximately 72% of the women were currently married, 20% had either been separated from or abandoned by their husbands. Two percent of the sample had been divorced at the time of the interview. My sample was predominantly Hindu (78%), with the other major religion being Neo-Buddhist (20%). Most of the women spoke Marathi (93%), although I found a few women whose native tongue was Gujarati or Hindi.

Over half of the women in the sample (61%) are living in joint families (see Table 2). The average joint family had approximately six members living together (including the children), although there were two families with over 13 members living in the same household (not shown here). As with the national and state datasets, the majority of the individuals are either wives of the household or daughter-in-laws. There are only 10 women who were the head of their households. In these cases, they were either separated from their marital and natal families and had set up independent households, or they were widowed.

Most of the women had their marriages arranged for them (76%). Approximately 15% of the women had a love/arranged marriage. This usually meant that they knew their husbands before they were married to them, but the marriages were still arranged by parents or extended family members (see Table 6). There are very few women who had chosen their husbands without their parents' approval (3%). Almost half of the women (40%) reported that they are very happy with their marriages, and 2% of sample reported absolutely no happiness in the marriage.

The socioeconomic status of the sample is fairly evenly divided. Although 9% of the sample has only two amenities in the SES scale, the majority of individuals are able to afford at least nine items in SES index (see Table 2). Approximately 30% of the women are illiterate in my sample, and about 20% have completed primary school education (Grade 5). Only 5% of the sample have completed more than 12 years of schooling.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics: Marital characteristics

<i>Sample characteristics</i>	<i>Fieldwork %</i>
Marital happiness (average, on a scale from 0 to 6)	3.89
Marital arrangement	
arranged marriage	75.9
love marriage	6.3
love marriage (no parental consent)	2.5
love/arranged marriage	15.2
Control scale	
tries to limit contact	31.3
jealous or possessive	23.9
insists on knowing where you are	23.8
calls names or insults	30.0
makes you feel inadequate	26.4
shouts or swears	37.5
prevents access to income	32.6
Total	80

With regard to working status, 61% of the women are working. This is not surprising given I was primarily dealing with organizations whose clientele were agricultural farmers and house workers. Only 2% of these women are not paid, but the rest are paid in cash. Approximately 6% of the women who were working are agricultural laborers in their family farms, 1% sell goods, and about 7% are self-employed (see Table 2). The remaining respondents work as agricultural laborers on someone else's farm or as house workers in someone else's home.

As with the national sample, over half of the women in this sample set money aside for themselves if they wished to (66%). Unlike the national sample, the decision-making powers rest with different individuals depending on the decision (see Table 3.1). With regard to cooking, women seem to be making the decisions. Women acting alone or jointly with their husbands seem to be making decisions regarding the purchase of jewelry (21.3% and 18.8%, respectively). As for visiting relatives, husbands seem to make the decisions in most of the households that were surveyed (37.5%, see Table 3.1).

With regard to attitudes towards domestic violence, approximately 16% of the women do not endorse any justification for the use of violence (not shown here). One in four women endorse at least five of the six justifications for domestic violence, while 7% of the women think that domestic violence is justified in all six scenarios. These numbers are slightly higher than the national sample. This is probably because approximately half of my sample has experienced domestic violence, unlike the national sample. It is, therefore, possible, that women who have experienced violence are more likely to see that violence is justified on some accounts.

Approximately 53% of the women have experienced violence from their husbands, and approximately 10% of the women have experienced violence from other members of

their marital households. None of the women I interviewed reported natal family violence (see Table 4). With regard to severity of violence, 10% of the women reported that their husbands had used only one form of violence (such as slapping or kicking) against them, and 6% of the women reported that their husbands had used all 10 forms of violence (that I had listed) against them. About a third of the women who reported that their husbands were violent also reported that the violence was usually carried out when the husband was inebriated (see Table 4). Given this background, let us answer the primary question posed by the dissertation: are there different kinds of domestic violence in India?

DIVERSITY OF CONTROL CONTEXTS

One of the aims of this project is to expand our understanding of physical violence beyond simplistic relations with power, control, and patriarchal structure. In doing so, I take a cue from Michael P. Johnson, who has conceptualized three major types of domestic violence differentiated with respect to the generalized pattern of control that one partner exhibits over another. The three types are:

Intimate Terrorism: In this type of violence, one partner attempts to exert generalized control over the other partner. This is what we generally think of when we think of domestic violence. A number of studies have shown that the majority of individuals perpetrating this violence are men and these forms of violence tend to dominate samples obtained from domestic violence shelters, court records, and hospitals (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Johnson 2001).

Situational Couple Violence: In this type of violence, neither of the partners is exerting generalized control, although there might be control exerted with specific situations. This violence is generally gender-neutral and tends to dominate general survey data.

Violent Resistance: This form of violence is when the individual is violent, but is resisting intimate terrorism. In fact, the partner is reacting to the partner's attempts to take general control.

Evidence for these forms of violence has been found in the United States and Great Britain (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Leone et al. 2004), but there has been no research done on violence in India that differentiates among the types of domestic violence. This is partly because violence has historically been assumed to be linked with the patriarchal structures that exert tremendous control over women in their families, and all violence perpetrated against women within the family is deemed to fall under this umbrella. Part of my fieldwork in India was to engage with the question: Is all violence against women in the family a product of patriarchal control? I argue that despite the context of inequality that characterizes gender relations in India, there is likely to be violence that is not intimately connected to patriarchal control.

There were other reasons for asking this question in the framework of India. I also wanted investigate this typology within the dynamics of the Indian household. One limitation of Johnson's typology is that it focuses on the husband-wife dyad in a nuclear family. In the context of India, the typical family consists of a hierarchical family structure with the oldest male at the top of the hierarchy and the youngest female (who is usually the youngest daughter-in-law) at the bottom of the family. As women age in the family, they gain in status and power. Because most of the violence that happens in India happens in the context of this complex family form, I explore the impact of multiple family forms on the manifestations of different kinds of domestic violence.

CONTROL CONTEXTS AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In order to examine whether the differing control contexts are related to the experience of domestic violence in my field study, I used the following control items that have been used in a number of U.S. and Canadian studies:

- whether husband tries to limit contact with other individuals
- whether the husband was jealous or possessive,
- whether the husband insisted on knowing at all time where the respondent was,
- whether the husband called her names in public,
- whether he made her feel inadequate,
- whether he shouted or swore at her, and
- whether he limited her access to income

The response options were never, rarely, sometimes, and often. These were coded on a 4 point scale ranging from 0 to 3. I performed a cluster analysis on these items for women who had experienced domestic violence. A cluster analysis identifies homogenous groups of cases in a population. It essentially identifies a set of groups that have similar profiles on a set of items. There are several ways to do this and I used the Ward's method. It is an agglomerative approach that selects each new case to add to a cluster on the basis of its effect on the overall homogeneity of the cluster. This produces tightly defined clusters.

Each of the control tactic items was standardized, and Euclidean distance was the measure of dissimilarity. The index of dissimilarity indicated a pattern of a gradual increase in the index up to a major jump and suggested that the number of clusters immediately prior to the increase was the optimal solution, in this case two clusters. In order to illustrate the characteristics of each of these clusters, I performed one-way ANOVAs to compare the means of the individual control items in the two clusters.

Table 7 identifies the characteristics of two clusters, one of which is high on all of the control items, the other low. Women in the first cluster were experiencing violence, but

very little control. These women reported, as indicated by the low scores on almost all the control items, that their husbands never or very rarely tried to limit contact, shouted or swore at them, or/and insulted them in public etc. Women in the second cluster, on the other hand, were experiencing violence along with high control exhibited by their husbands. Women in cluster 2 reported that they husbands sometimes or often limited contact with others, limited access to income, monitored their movements, and/or made them feel inadequate etc. These clusters clearly exhibited characteristics of what is generally known as Situational Couple Violence (SCV) and Intimate Terrorism (IT).

Table 7. ANOVA Table : Johnson's typology with control items

<i>Variables</i>	<i>SCV</i> <i>(n=17)</i>	<i>IT</i> <i>(n=23)</i>
Tries to limit contact with others ($F = 1332.68, df = 2, p=.00$)	0.00	2.82
Is jealous or possessive ($F = 26.37, df = 2, p=.00$)	0.29	1.91
Insists on knowing where you are ($F = 31.22, df = 2, p=.00$)	0.17	2.48
Insults you in public ($F = 46.23, df = 2, p = 0.00$)	0.00	2.08
Makes you feel inadequate ($F = 28.11, df = 2, p = 0.00$)	0.47	1.82
Shouts or swears at you ($F = 54.23, df = 2, p = 0.00$)	0.88	2.47
Limits your access to income ($F = 77.98, df = 2, p = 0.00$)	0.59	2.52

A caveat must be stated before we proceed. The fieldwork sample used in these analyses is not representative of any general population. Given the ways in which data were collected, it is definitely skewed towards poorer families and, of course, more violent relationships. In addition, because the number of participants is low, statistical analyses will have very low power and we should examine the differences among the groups as indicative of trends.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTROL CONTEXTS IN VIOLENT RELATIONSHIPS

Similar to the analyses done in the large-scale quantitative data, I examined the influence of family and individual characteristics on the types of violence to understand the relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence. In addition, I also investigated characteristics such as marital happiness, use of alcohol, and coping mechanisms that could not be assessed with the secondary analyses. The limited sample size precludes multivariate analyses.

Domestic Violence: Forty-six percent of the sample has not experienced any domestic violence. When we examine the different types of violence within the sample, we find that approximately 29% of the sample has experienced intimate terrorism, and 21% experienced situational couple violence. The other 4% of the sample experienced violence from individuals other than their husbands, such as mother-in-laws or sister-in-laws. Thus, as with most agency samples, the majority of the violence experienced is intimate terrorism (58%).

Table 8. Cross tabulations of violence with Johnson's typology

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No violence</i> (<i>n</i> =38)	<i>SCV</i> (<i>n</i> =17)	<i>IT</i> (<i>n</i> =23)	<i>Total</i> (<i>n</i> =78)
<i>Hit by in-law</i> ($\chi^2 = 3.34, df = 2, p=.18$)				
No (<i>n</i> = 66)	48.5	22.7	28.8	100.0
Yes (<i>n</i> = 7)	14.3	28.6	57.1	100.0
<i>Hit by mother-in-law</i> ($\chi^2 = 3.86, df = 2, p=.16$)				
No (<i>n</i> = 67)	47.8	23.9	28.4	100.0
Yes (<i>n</i> = 6)	16.7	16.7	66.7	100.0
<i>Severity of violence</i> ($F = 18.77, df = 1, p=.00$)	0.00	3.06	6.90	

Ten percent of the women also experienced violence from their in-laws, much of which seems to have been initiated by their mothers-in-law, although brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law were also identified as perpetrators of the violence. Fifty-seven percent of

women who reported being hit by an in-law were experiencing intimate terrorism from their husband, compared with 29% of women who not hit by an in-law (see Table 8). The pattern is the same if we look only at violence from one's mother-in-law (67% vs. 28%). Research on dowry violence indicates that the violence is often perpetrated by members of the joint family in attempts to elicit money from the natal family (Vindhya 2000). Given the high control contexts of intimate terrorism, it is likely women are closely monitored by the husbands and extended family members, and any transgression is dealt by violence to elicit compliance from the wives. Unlike the larger quantitative sample, the women in this sample did not report any violence from their natal families after marriage. Severity of violence was also assessed. Women were asked whether they were slapped, kicked, burned, slammed against the wall, and other modes of violence. A scale recording both the number of times women were beaten as well as the use of different modes was combined to form the severity scale. We find that women in intimate terrorist relationships are experiencing greater severity of violence (6.9 in a scale that runs from 0 to 10, see Table 8), compared to women in situational couple violent relationships (3.06).

Types of violence and sample variation

Sample site: In the *Pimpri sample* and in the *Corporation sample*, women were recruited by the caseworkers because they knew that the individuals had experienced domestic violence (see Table 8). This is probably one of the primary reasons for the higher concentration of intimate terrorism in Pimpri and Corporation samples. Women reporting violence in the *Somatne sample* (the only rural site in the sample) were more likely to be reporting situational couple violence, rather than intimate terrorism (representing only 40% of the violence).

Table 9: Cross tabulations of family characteristics with Johnson's typology

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No violence</i> (<i>n</i> =38)	<i>SCV</i> (<i>n</i> =17)	<i>IT</i> (<i>n</i> =23)	<i>Total</i> (<i>n</i> =78)
<i>Sample site</i> ($\chi^2 = 3.37, df = 4, p=.497$)				
Somatne (n=29)	60.0	24.0	16.0	100.0
Pimpri (n=36)	43.8	18.8	37.5	100.0
Corporation (n=15)	43.2	21.5	35.1	100.0
<i>Social habitat</i> ($\chi^2 = 3.31, df = 2, p=.191$)				
urban (n=54)	60.0	24.0	16.0	100.0
rural (n= 24)	43.4	20.8	35.8	100.0
<i>Religion</i> ($\chi^2 = 7.1, df = 4, p=.13$)				
Hindu (n =60)	56.7	18.3	25.0	100.0
Buddhist (n =16)	25.0	31.3	50.0	100.0
Muslim (n = 2)	0.0	50.0	43.8	100.0
<i>SES</i> (F = 21.04, df = 1, p=.27)	7.81	6.76	6.61	
<i>Family structure</i> ($\chi^2 = 8.50, df = 4, p=.07$)				
Nuclear (n=29)	65.5	13.8	20.7	100.0
Joint (n=48)	39.6	25.0	35.4	100.0
Other (n=1)	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0

Types of violence and family characteristics

Religion: The sample is not very diverse with respect to religion. Most of the women are either Hindu (78%) or Buddhist (20%). Buddhists were more likely than Hindus to have experienced both situational couple violence (31.3% vs. 18.3%), and intimate terrorism (43.8% vs. 25%) (see Table 9). Sampling technique may have contributed to this finding. One of the possible reasons could be that the city of Pune and its surrounding areas are both Hindu-dominated and upper caste/upper class. The Buddhist women I interviewed came primarily from the lower caste/class sections of Pimpri. So, it is likely that this finding is partly tapping into socioeconomic class in addition to religion.

Rural and Urban: Most of my sample is located in the urban regions (69%) and over half of the women seem to experience no violence, and a small percentage of them (16%)

experience intimate terrorism (see Table 9). The differences indicate a higher percentage of intimate terrorism reported in the rural areas (36%), compared to urban areas (16%). Since this data is based on a convenience sample, I can only speculate that these differences might be due to sampling technique rather than any intrinsic difference.

SES: There doesn't seem to be any effect of socioeconomic status on women experiencing violence (see Table 9). Although there is a slight difference between women experiencing violence and women not experiencing violence (see Table 9), these differences are minor. This is probably because of the limited variation in the sample with regard to socioeconomic status.

Family Structure: Unlike the national dataset, family violence seem more likely in joint families than in nuclear families (see Table 9). Both intimate terrorism and situational couple violence are more likely to occur in joint families (35.4% and 25% respectively) compared to nuclear families (20.7% and 13.8%). In addition, we see a higher number of women experiencing intimate terrorism than situational couple violence in both types of family structure. This finding has two possible explanations: (1) more family members translates to more friction in the household, disagreements escalate into arguments, and arguments potentially could escalate to violence (SCV), and (2) the hierarchical structure of the family encourages the husband to exert control over his wife (IT), perhaps even at the instigation of other family members. These dynamics between family structure and domestic violence are explored in the next chapter.

Decision-making: Several variables were used to estimate decision-making process in the household. These decisions ranged from making normal household decisions (like cooking) to the purchase of major items (such as jewelry), and also to physical mobility (visiting relatives). The biggest trend is when individuals other than the husband and wives

are making decisions. Fifty or more percent of women experience intimate terrorism when others are making decisions in the household. This includes decisions to cook, to obtain healthcare, and purchasing jewelry. So, it appears that the more control the extended family has over the woman, the more likely that she experiences intimate terrorism. This can be contrasted with the percentage of women who experience intimate terrorism when they make the decisions themselves (see Table 10). These patterns hold true, but to a smaller degree, with situational couple violence. This leads me to believe that the interpersonal elements (including specific control contexts) in the familial household play a major role in decision-making processes. Thus, these results must be assessed with respect to the diversity of family forms that exist in India.

Permission needed: One of the most striking patterns with regard to physical mobility is that women who are not allowed to go to visit relatives or to go to the market are more likely to experience intimate terrorism (78% in both cases), compared to women who do not need permission (7.4%, and 6.3% respectively). This finding gives us another indication regarding the influence of family control on their experience of violence. Curtailing women's activities seems to be intimately tied to high-control violence. As reflected in the previous analyses, high patriarchal contexts seem to be indicative of intimate terrorism.

Types of violence and individual characteristics

Education: Unlike the patterns that were clearly evident in the national data, education doesn't seem to be a factor in the experience of domestic violence in this sample (see Table 11). Although the three women who had attended higher secondary school did not experience violence, there is no clear pattern for the other education categories.

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No violence</i> (<i>n</i> =38)	<i>SCV</i> (<i>n</i> =17)	<i>IT</i> (<i>n</i> =23)	<i>Total</i> (<i>n</i> =78)
<i>Who makes the decision</i>				
<i>To cook?</i> ($\chi^2 = 17.29$, <i>df</i> = 8, <i>p</i> =.027)				
Respondent (<i>n</i> =41)	58.5	24.4	17.1	100.0
Husband (<i>n</i> =6)	33.3	33.3	33.3	100.0
Jointly with husband (<i>n</i> = 2)	50.0	50.0	0.0	100.0
Others (<i>n</i> = 19)	15.8	21.1	63.2	100.0
Jointly with others (<i>n</i> = 5)	60.0	0.0	40.0	100.0
<i>To obtain healthcare?</i> ($\chi^2 = 9.90$, <i>df</i> = 8, <i>p</i> =.271)				
Respondent (<i>n</i> = 22)	45.5	27.3	27.3	100.0
Husband (<i>n</i> = 24)	41.7	29.2	29.2	100.0
Jointly with husband (<i>n</i> = 8)	87.5	12.5	0.0	100.0
Others (<i>n</i> = 9)	22.2	22.2	55.6	100.0
Jointly with others (<i>n</i> = 5)	60.0	20.0	20.0	100.0
<i>To purchase jewelry?</i> ($\chi^2 = 24.40$, <i>df</i> = 8, <i>p</i> =.002)				
Respondent (<i>n</i> =16)	68.8	12.5	18.8	100.0
Husband (<i>n</i> =10)	20.0	50.0	30.0	100.0
Jointly with husband (<i>n</i> =15)	93.3	6.7	0.0	100.0
Others (<i>n</i> =6)	0.0	50.0	50.0	100.0
Jointly with others (<i>n</i> =1)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<i>About staying with family?</i> ($\chi^2 = 18.08$, <i>df</i> = 6, <i>p</i> =.00)				
Respondent (<i>n</i> =18)	61.1	27.8	11.1	100.0
Husband (<i>n</i> =21)	28.6	23.8	47.6	100.0
Jointly with husband (<i>n</i> =13)	84.6	15.4	0.0	100.0
Others (<i>n</i> =0, not included in analysis)	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Jointly with others (<i>n</i> =12)	25.0	25.0	50.0	100.0
<i>Do you need permission to</i>				
<i>Visit relatives?</i> ($\chi^2 = 29.87$, <i>df</i> = 4, <i>p</i> =.00)				
No (<i>n</i> =32)	77.8	14.8	7.4	100.0
Yes (<i>n</i> =26)	28.6	34.3	37.1	100.0
Not allowed to go (<i>n</i> =9)	11.1	11.1	77.8	100.0
<i>Go to market?</i> ($\chi^2 = 25.58$, <i>df</i> = 4, <i>p</i> =.000)				
No (<i>n</i> =27)	75.0	18.8	6.3	100.0
Yes (<i>n</i> =35)	19.2	38.5	42.3	100.0
Not allowed to go (<i>n</i> =9)	11.1	11.1	77.8	100.0

Labor force participation: With respect to employment, we find that 64% of the women who do not work experience some form of domestic violence, either situational couple violence or intimate terrorism and 60% of women who work for someone else also experience some

form of violence, either situational couple violence or intimate terrorism. Given that the numbers in the cells are quite small, we cannot really make any concrete predictions regarding the effect of working status on the likelihood of experiencing violence. Thus, it is difficult to predict from these data whether labor force participation decreases or increases women's chances of experiencing domestic violence.

Table 11. Cross tabulations of individual characteristics with Johnson's typology

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No violence</i> (<i>n</i> =38)	<i>SCV</i> (<i>n</i> =17)	<i>IT</i> (<i>n</i> =23)	<i>Total</i> (<i>n</i> =78)
<i>Education</i> ($\chi^2 = 8.40, df = 8, p = .395$)				
illiterate < primary school (<i>n</i> =24)	50.0	29.2	20.8	100.0
primary school (0 to 5) (<i>n</i> =16)	50.0	12.5	37.5	100.0
middle school (6 to 8) (<i>n</i> =20)	45.0	30.0	25.0	100.0
high school (9 to 10) (<i>n</i> =15)	40.0	13.3	46.7	100.0
higher secondary school (+2) (<i>n</i> =3)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
<i>Current employment</i> ($\chi^2 = 5.43, df = 8, p = .71$)				
no work (<i>n</i> =26)	46.2	23.1	30.8	100.0
family farm (<i>n</i> =5)	80.0	20.0	0.0	100.0
selling things (<i>n</i> =1)	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
self-employed (<i>n</i> =6)	66.7	16.7	16.7	100.0
work for someone else (<i>n</i> =37)	50.5	24.3	35.1	100.0
<i>Contribution to household</i> ($\chi^2 = 9.96, df = 10, p = .44$)				
no work (<i>n</i> =34)	50.0	20.6	29.4	100.0
no contribution (<i>n</i> =10)	70.0	10.0	20.0	100.0
less than half (<i>n</i> =15)	46.7	33.3	20.0	100.0
Half (<i>n</i> =9)	33.3	22.2	44.4	100.0
more than half (<i>n</i> =3)	66.7	0.0	33.3	100.0
all (<i>n</i> =5)	0.0	40.0	60.0	100.00
<i>Allowed to set money aside</i> ($\chi^2 = 19.40, df = 2, p = .000$)				
No (<i>n</i> =24)	12.5	25.0	62.5	100.0
Yes (<i>n</i> =49)	61.2	22.4	16.3	100.0
<i>Attitudes towards d.v.</i> ($F = 18.77, df = 1, p = .00$)				
	2.97	3.76	3.39	
<i>Marital happiness</i> ($F = 20.04, df = 2, p = .00$)				
	5.13	3.71	2.30	

Financial independence: All five women in my sample who contribute all of the household income experience either situational couple violence or intimate terrorism. Women who are allowed to set aside money are less likely to experience intimate terrorism

compared to women who are not allowed to set aside money (16.3% vs. 62.5%). So, it seems that familial control does translate into greater likelihood of experiencing intimate terrorism.

Attitudes towards domestic violence: When we examine attitudes towards domestic violence, we find that women experiencing violence are more likely to endorse domestic violence compared to women not experiencing violence. In a scale where 0 indicates no justifications for violence, and six indicates all six justifications for violence, women who have experienced no violence were less likely to endorse domestic violence (2.97) compared to women experiencing situational couple violence (3.76) and intimate terrorism (3.39).

Additional characteristics

Marital happiness: An analysis of the report of marital happiness gives us a clear idea regarding women's perception of marriage. Women experiencing intimate terrorism are much less likely to say that they are happy in their marriage. In a scale where 0 indicates not at all happy and 7 indicates very happy, we find that women experiencing intimate terrorism report lower levels of happiness (2.30) compared to women experiencing situational couple violence (3.71). In fact, not surprisingly, we find that women experiencing violence are much less likely to report marital happiness compared to women experiencing no violence (5.13).

Influence of alcohol: Alcohol seems to be closely related to the types of domestic violence (see Table 12). Approximately 74% of the husbands who were drunk during an assault were intimate terrorists, as opposed to 38% of the men who were not drunk. The same pattern is evident for husbands who were regularly beating their wives when drunk (73% of whom were intimate terrorists, compared with 33% of those who were not regularly drunk). Thus, there seems to be a definite connection between alcohol and coercive control (see Table 11).

Alcohol has historically been linked to violence in two primary ways – one, as an instigator for the fighting; and secondly, as a cause for the fighting. In some instances, drunken husbands find an excuse (too much salt, children are noisy, etc.) to beat their wives. One of the primary reasons cited by women whose husbands hit them when they are drunk is that men lose any inhibition when they are drunk, and so very little is required to warrant a beating. In other instances, the violence perpetrated by a husband arises from arguments relating to his excessive alcohol consumption. Thus, alcohol can be related to violence in many complex ways.

Table 12. Cross tabulations of use of alcohol with Johnson's typology

<i>Variables</i>	<i>SCV</i> (<i>n=17</i>)	<i>IT</i> (<i>n=23</i>)	<i>Total</i> (<i>n=78</i>)
Drunk when violent ($\chi^2 = 5.17, df = 1, p=.023$)			
No (n=16)	62.5	37.5	100.0
Yes (n=23)	26.1	73.9	100.0
How often drunk? ($\chi^2 = 5.41, df = 1, p=.020$)			
Never (n=12)	66.7	33.3	100.0
Often (n=23)	26.1	73.9	100.0

Coping: Although different kinds of coping strategies are used in response to domestic violence (see Table 13), we find that women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism use these coping strategies differently (see Table 14). For example, we see that women experiencing intimate terrorism seem to be using a wider range of coping mechanisms than those experiencing situational couple violence. Women experiencing intimate terrorism want to leave or try to leave the relationship (42.8% and 28.6% respectively). They also shout back (27%), fight back (23%), and try to talk to their husbands (69%). Women experiencing intimate terrorism just as often do nothing in response to violence (41%). They become silent (73%) and comply with their husband's

requests (50%). Women experiencing intimate terrorism, therefore, do not restrict themselves to only conciliatory or resistance behaviors.

Table 13: Descriptive statistics: Coping strategies

Coping strategies	<i>Fieldwork</i> %
ever tried to leave	9.9
ever rely on someone	23.8
ever ask anyone to stop violence	29.9
someone intervene	26.2
comply with everything he says	22.5
try to stay out of the way	11.2
apologize to him	21.2
don't do anything	17.5
become silent	36.2
shout back	8.8
fight back	7.5
try to talk to him	27.5
dv is not important	6.2
Total	39

Although women experiencing situational couple violence also use a wide range of coping behaviors, they seem to be doing them in lower numbers. For example, women experiencing situational couple violence rarely seem to shout or fight back (7% in both cases), as compared to women experiencing intimate terrorism. In addition, they are also more likely to deem the violence as not important (27%) as compared with women experiencing intimate terrorism (5%). This indicates that women seem to be using a broader range of coping mechanism to cope with the combined effects of control and violence. However, since the differences within these groups are not significant, we must look to the qualitative data to give us a better understanding of the ways in which coping strategies are used by women to cope with intimate terrorism and situational couple violence.

Table 14: Cross tabulations of Johnson's Typology with coping strategies

	<i>% SCV</i> (<i>n=17</i>)	<i>% IT</i> (<i>n=23</i>)
Ever want to leave? ($\chi^2 = 0.994, df = 1, p=.319, n=13$)	26.7	42.9
Ever tried to leave? ($\chi^2 = 1.17, df=1, p=.278, n=8$)	13.3	28.6
Anyone intervene ($\chi^2 = 0.755, df = 1, p=.385, n=19$)	60.0	45.5
Every rely on anyone ($\chi^2 = 1.30, df = 1, p=.254, n=19$)	40.0	59.1
Ever ask anyone for help ($\chi^2 = 1.713, df = 1, p=.191, n=22$)	46.7	68.2
Comply with everything ($\chi^2 = 0.359, df = 1, p=.549, n=17$)	40.0	50.0
Shout back ($\chi^2 = 2.45, df = 1, p=.116, n=7$)	6.7	27.3
Fight back ($\chi^2 = 1.69, df = 1, p=.193, n=6$)	6.7	22.7
Become silent ($\chi^2 = 0.01, df = 1, p=.967, n=27$)	73.3	72.7
Apologize ($\chi^2 = 0.55, df = 1, p=.457, n=17$)	53.3	40.9
Think DV is not important ($\chi^2 = 3.51, df = 1, p=.061, n=5$)	26.7	4.8
Don't do anything ($\chi^2 = 0.21, df = 1, p=.64, n=14$)	33.3	40.9
Try to talk to him ($\chi^2 = 2.88, df = 1, p=.09, n=21$)	40.0	68.2

Summary of fieldwork analyses:

One of the major contributions of this research is that it documents, for the first time, the two different kinds of violence that are currently prevalent in Indian families: situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. Additionally, these two types of violence differ from each other in terms of their relationship to a number of family and individual characteristics. For example, when we compare the marital happiness of women experiencing situational couple violence, we find that women experiencing situational couple violence report higher marital happiness as compared to women experiencing intimate terrorism. In addition, we find that physical mobility and decision-making in the household

are different for women experiencing intimate terrorism. It appears that women experiencing intimate terrorism are severely restricted in their role within the household as well as their physical mobility outside the household, as compared to women experiencing situational couple violence. Additionally, we find that women in joint family structures are more likely to experience domestic violence, especially intimate terrorism.

Another important finding is the use of alcohol in intimate terrorism. We find that more women experiencing intimate terrorism report that their husbands are drunk during the violent assaults compared to women experiencing situational couple violence. Thus, we must examine the full impact of alcohol on domestic violence in the qualitative data. In addition, given that women experiencing intimate terrorism seem to be using a wider range of coping strategies as compared to women experiencing situational couple violence, we must examine the circumstances under which these coping strategies are used.

The socio-demographic variables such as education and labor force participation that were significant predictors for women in the national dataset do not seem to have much impact on the type of violence women experienced in the fieldwork data. But it would be foolish to dismiss their impact, since both still inform the world-view of the participants as evident from the qualitative narratives.

Another important finding is that higher patriarchal contexts such as family structure, decision-making, and labor force participation seem to be related to intimate terrorism. This is in opposition to the pattern that we find in the national data where greater patriarchal contexts seem to be related to lower instances of violence experienced by women. Two reasons are likely to be responsible for this finding. First, given that the fieldwork data comes from a non-random convenience sample and the national data comes from a random stratified sample, the differences in the findings could be related to the

composition of the different samples. Secondly, given that the national sample does not distinguish between situational couple violence and intimate terrorism, we cannot be sure the impact that each type of violence has on the national data. Given our constraints on data, this analysis is better suited to the qualitative data.

In the next chapter, I will present qualitative data about patriarchal family dynamics and domestic violence. I will first examine the nature of the violence used by husbands, their relationship to control contexts, and finally, women's perceptions of motives and objectives of the violence.

A voice

They mutilate they torment each other
with silences with words
as if they had another
life to live

they do so
as if they had forgotten
that their bodies are inclined to death
that the insides of men
easily break down

ruthless with each other
they are weaker
than plants and animals
they can be killed by a word
by a smile by a look

Tadeusz Rozewicz

Chapter 5

THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF CONTROL AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: Examining narratives of domestic violence

The qualitative data collected from the 80 women in Pune revealed numerous control tactics used by husbands. In Table Error! Reference source not found.5, these control tactics have been organized in terms of the types of control first conceptualized by the Duluth model of intimate partner violence (Pence & Paymar 1993). These control tactics include economic abuse, male privilege, children, isolation, and minimizing, denying, and blaming women, using threats, coercion and intimidation. While most of the control tactics used in India neatly fit into the Duluth model, some do not. For example, deprivation can be easily categorized under economic abuse or under intimidation, depending on the purpose it served. Depriving women of money or their own wages can be categorized under economic abuse, whereas denial of food and healthcare can easily be identified as intimidation.

These control tactics are often used for multiple purposes, and the classification system has been created for purposes of simplicity and brevity. In addition to these control tactics, other factors were identified as critical to our understanding of the relationship between patriarchal control and domestic violence. The use of alcohol, the influence of family structure and marital context, and the effect of familial/marital social role proved to be important indicators of the control dynamics that exist in the patriarchal families in India. Because most of the control tactics used by husbands in India translate well cross-culturally, I will first examine the control tactics identified by Pence & Paymar (1993).

Table 15: Different types of control tactics

<i>Control tactics (Pence & Paymar, 1993)</i>	<i>Control tactics used in India</i>
Economic abuse	Deprivation, misuse of finances
Using male privilege	Withholding affection, neglect, and leaving behaviors
Using children	Children as cause of violence or used as bargaining tools
Isolation	Locking, suspicious, monitoring movement, living arrangement
Minimizing, blaming, and denying	Humiliation, verbal abuse, neglect, sweet talking, blaming
Intimidation	Burning, stalking, attempted murder
Coercion and threats	Threatening, blackmailing

ECONOMIC ABUSE

One of the prominent ways in which men in this study control women's lives is through finances. Approximately 40% of the women in the sample were not earning any income, so they were financially dependent on their husbands. In addition, some of the women who were working for money were not in charge of their earnings (5% for IT, 2% in SCV).

Interviewer: Did your husband know how much you got?

DV066 (IT)²: In those days I used to get around 20. I used to give him the money...All that I got from work...he used to take...“Or else don't go to work”, he used to say. Then I had to give.

² All cases will be marked as NV (No violence), SCV (situational couple violence) or IT (intimate terrorism). In addition, the interviewer will henceforth be indicated by I.

In the next example, we see that while women might ask their husband for money, it is up to the husband to bestow his permission. Without this explicit permission, some of the women could not spend the money even though they were given their husband's salary in whole. So, even while women often told me that they were in charge of the money and were primarily responsible for the management of the finances, a slight probing revealed that they were not given freedom to dispose of it as they wished. For example, when we asked the woman to be more explicit about the decision-making process, we found that husbands often retained a lot of control over money that they 'bestowed' on their wives.

I: You can't spend as you like?

DV044 (NV): "As I like" means I ask my husband when I need something. I tell him that I want to buy this particular thing, so I am taking money. Once I take it, then there is no issue about it.

In this case, DV044 was given a lot of freedom with regard to the purchases as long as she informed her husband. But in some cases, women's demands or requests were dismissed, and in many cases, completely neglected. A few of these women were given money and their expenses closely monitored. Others were entirely at the mercy of the whims and fancies of their husbands entirely. Women who were experiencing violence, regardless of control context, were more likely to express the following sentiments:

I: Did your husband take the decision [for purchase of article]?

DV057 (SCV): I had to ask him. Everything according to his wishes... Nothing according to my wishes. If he wants to do something then only it is done. Now what is my job? If there is some excess money, then I keep aside Rs.10 or 20 from it. When there's need for something, then I take it out and use it.

Whether experiencing situational couple violence or intimate terrorism, women often expressed bitterness, resentment, anger, frustration, and helplessness. Even when women were working, they were usually unable to provide for the entire household by

themselves. A lot of women experiencing violence and some women experiencing no violence report being constantly worried about the household expenses because of this restriction on their financial freedom.

Women experiencing intimate terrorism were able to articulate that the restriction on the access to money was primarily to control their lives in very specific ways. A few of them argued that because of limited funds, they were unable to make any decisions in the household or to provide adequate care to their children, and were severely compromised in terms of their autonomy. For example, one of the women (DV065) expressed frustration that she was unable to provide money for schooling her daughter. Her marital family had restricted her daughter's education. Since DV065 was unemployed, she bemoaned the decision made by her marital family but could not do anything to change it.

In addition to the helplessness that women experiencing intimate terrorism felt, they were often questioned and demeaned if they did not earn (enough money). In one example, even after DV024 had asked for the purchase of a fairly common personal commodity, she was rebuked in a way that was insulting and humiliating.

I: Did your husband give you money for your own expenses of household expenses?

DV024 (IT): He gave me only 3 or 4 times, but I spent it for him. Bought vegetables, bought him chappals. He never gave me anything for my personal expenses. Once I asked him to get me talcum powder... Then he asked me to use ash instead.

In other examples, men often accused women of nagging them for more money and verbally abused them for draining or straining the household finances. Almost all of the women who were completely financially dependent on their husband had been accused of being burdens on the household. In many marital homes, husbands were not always the ones in control of the household finances. In most of the joint families, mother-in-laws assumed primary

responsibility with regard to household finances. In these cases, the economic control of women's lives was exercised by other family members. In fact, one of the primary complaints of most of the women experiencing intimate terrorism was that they were deferential to their mother-in-laws much more than to their husbands, especially when it came to household expenses.

I: Did you two have arguments about money?

DV066 (IT): No. I didn't have any say in it. My mother-in-law was there to take care of money.

and in another example:

I: How much did he take for his own personal expenses from it?

DV070 (IT): When he gave his whole salary to his mother, she used to give him Rs. 350... He was asked to manage everything including my expenses and the rest she [kept].

In fact, very few women were in charge of the household finances without any obligations to other individuals in the household. But there was considerable variability with regard to economic abuse in the marital home. Most of the instances of severe economic abuse were restricted to intimate terrorists. There were several instances where women, especially those experiencing situational couple violence, were not economically restricted by their husbands. For example, in seven cases, men who had been violent towards their wives did not care about money at all, and seemed unconcerned about how their earnings were spent.

I: Does your husband give you all the money he earns or keeps something for himself?

DV004 (SCV): This is what he does – he gives me and asks for whatever he needs and takes it from me. Later, he gives me account of the money that he took from me.

So, there does seem to be a qualitative difference between the economic restrictions faced by women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. While women

experiencing situational couple violence might have some restrictions on where they can spend money, most of the women experiencing intimate terrorism typically do not have access to financial resources.

MALE PRIVILEGE

Male privilege in the Indian household is socially instituted in many ways. For example, one of the ways in which men demonstrated their privilege is by not giving any explanations to their wives about their behavior. For the majority of the women in my sample, the authority of men in the household is sacrosanct and in certain cases, not to be questioned. One of the ways in which men exerted their privilege was by restricting women's movements. For example, most women experiencing intimate terrorism do not even go to the local vegetable market without expressed permission from their husbands. Women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism often were beaten because of the perceived rejection of this 'natural' authority.

I: Do you think that your husband did the right thing when he beat you?

DV070 (IT): No. It is wrong. Because he never tries to make an effort to understand if I express some different opinion. He thinks that whatever he says must be done all the time.

For women experiencing intimate terrorism, this privilege was severely abused. Intimate terrorists used a myriad of excuses for assaulting their wives, ranging from the excess salt in the food to 'talking back'. Talking back was usually a euphemism for any conversation that women had that opposed their husband's wishes. Any opinion or statement expressed by the wife in response to the husband's statement was widely interpreted as 'talking back'. Moreover, women experiencing intimate terrorism complained that even angry gestures (such as handling their kitchen utensils loudly in anger) was often interpreted as 'talking back', and they were beaten for it.

I: What reasons does your husband give you for beating you?

DV012 (SCV): He says that I must listen to whatever he says, I must not talk back, I must keep quiet. If I behave like that, then things are good. I should not talk more. I should quietly listen to whatever he says, when he goes on talking ‘Then why should I beat you?’ he says.

As stated in the example before, women experiencing situational couple violence were not exempt from violence that primarily came from ‘disobeying’ their husbands. This reaffirming of men’s privilege over the household was also evident in the husband’s neglect of the household. Many women experiencing intimate terrorism complained that even when their husbands could support them, they chose not to because they liked to keep their wives ‘in order’. In some extreme cases of neglect, men flaunted their privilege in front of their wives and children by locking them outside their homes and allowing their entry into the household only after the husband came home from work. In one instance, a man locked up the home and disappeared to his village for two weeks. His wife had to move to her natal family in desperation. In other examples, this neglect translated into less severe, but certainly traumatic terms:

I: Did you have fights about money?

DV076 (IT): Yes. About money. About work. My husband didn’t give us any money. If at all he brought something home it would be “vadaa- paav” [A burger-like fast food item with fried potato filling stuffed inside small size bread slit into two parts.] These kids didn’t have anything to eat nor did I. But he used to eat and fight.

Men were also indifferent to their families. This indifference can be distinguished from neglect because the latter implied an intentional indifference to the family. While some men maliciously used their male privilege by neglecting their families (as illustrated by the above example), others used their male privilege by ignoring their family’s needs. While 13 husbands were not mindful of their family because of their addiction to drugs or alcohol, others asserted their male privilege through their unwillingness to back down in any

argument, whether in a verbal or physical assault. In the example given below, DV011 left her husband to live with her natal family after a fight. This is a fairly common coping strategy for women. After a while, the husband comes to the natal family to pick up his wife as a way of apologizing for his earlier misbehavior. The following scenario, however, is not common, given the length of the separation:

I: Why did you come to stay at your parent's place for five years?

DV011 (NV): We had fight about the farm. We shared the ownership of the farm with my brother-in-law. So, when we took our share separately, there were fights. Then without asking my husband, my two brothers and I came back here because we were annoyed. Then my husband was mad at me, because I didn't tell him. After five years, my children started understanding that their mother was not with them. Then he came to take me back. In those five years, he must have enquired with others how I was doing. But he didn't come to me directly to find out how I was.

In this case, we see that the husband asserts his power and authority by refusing to apologize and pick her from her natal family, primarily because she leaves the household without telling him (a major breach of marital conduct). Since decorum prohibits her from traveling back to her marital family without him coming to get her, she had to stay for five years with her natal family and only after the intervention of her children was she allowed back to her husband. For many women, this assertion of male privilege is all too clear. For example, DV003 had started experiencing violence from her husband after she separated from him for marrying her sister. She is quite articulate about pointing out the specific reasons for the assault.

DV003 (IT): Now he feels that I should constantly bow before him, continuously keep asking for things, I should stay with them and have a joint family. Now when I am earning, he can remain idle and will be taken care of. But I am not ready for that. Now kids are also earning, so he wants to take charge of everybody's money. We have no debts. He can't tolerate that. Now that's why he beats me.

The act of separation from her husband in addition to her independence from her husband has been identified by DV003 as the primary reason for the experience of violence. Thus, male privilege is often abused by men to assert their authority. This assertion, as you can see from the case of DV011 does not necessarily involve the use of violence, although intimate terrorists may resort to violence. Thus, the ways in which men assert privilege in the study is both subtle and conspicuous.

CHILDREN

Intimate terrorists used children in two ways to control women's lives. The first and the most obvious way was to include the children in their control tactics. Children were often used to insult or humiliate their wives. One of the ways to accomplish this was to demean their mothers or make them carry humiliating messages to their mothers.

DV014 (IT): He asked our son 'Where had your mother gone?' He said 'No, Pappa. Mummy was sleeping'. Then he asked 'Whose house did she go to sleep in?' He used to reach such a low level that I can't tell you.

Children also bore the brunt of the violence and control tactics that their fathers used against their mothers. They were often involved before, during, or after the episodes of violence, as the example below indicates:

AshaTai: Do you want to say your mother kept mum through, when your father beat her?

Daughter of DV009 (IT): He made us sit outside home. Till 2-3 o'clock in the night, he forced us sit outside the house without our books. And he beat mother inside.

Although DV009 was quite active in making sure that the children did not see her experiencing violence, 10 years later it is still quite apparent that the children were affected by it.

Another way of humiliating women was to use their children's (mis)behavior to chasten their wives. This chastening could be minor offenses such as not monitoring their children appropriately to 'major' offenses like corporal punishment. Some of the women reported that they were beaten by their husbands because they had spanked their children. This was most likely to happen in cases of situational couple violence. For example, the only time DV077 was beaten was when she hit her child.

I: He beats you because you spanked your daughter?

DV077 (SCV): Yes. Because of that. Nothing else.

Given it is hard to ignore the irony of the situation, this example illustrates a key point: the use of violence itself is not stigmatized in the marital household. Violence is accepted as long as it follows the rules of authority in the relationship. For example, a mother has power and authority over her child, so corporal punishment is acceptable. But in this case, the power and authority of the husband over his wife overrides the one she has over her children. Thus, DV077's husband disciplines his wife for disciplining their child. While women may not have the authority over their children, they do bear the responsibility for the well-being of the children.

DV063 (IT): He beat me because of our son. My son had spilled some leftovers. I didn't clean it up immediately. So he beat me.

In the previous example, DV063 was beaten because she had not performed her duties as a wife and a mother. However, the exact duties of a mother or a wife can often be vague and subject to change, especially in relationships that are characterized by intimate terrorism. The concept of being a good mother is well-defined in most relationships, but in the context of intimate terrorism, it is a murky issue. In one instance, a woman was beaten because her child had an accident while traveling to school. While she understood that she was not

directly responsible for the accident, DV036 was beaten because she was careless in her duties as a mother.

Another way in which women are controlled by intimate terrorists is through the threat of being separated from their children. Because men often moved away and remarried without any repercussions, women in violent relationships were quite cognizant of the fact that it was not an idle threat. This, coupled with the realization that women would not be able to take care of their children by themselves, often led women to stay in a violent relationship. Many women that we talked to had reconciled themselves to the idea that they would not be able to see their children if they moved away from their violent relationships. Even for a fair number of women who had come to the organization to file petitions to regain custody of their children, they had very little hope that they could see their children again.

I: If you divorce, are you going to keep your son with you?

DV063 (IT): That is not possible. I think he will not give the son, simply because he is 'the son' and so they want him.

As DV063 identifies, this threat to take away the children often applied only to sons. Women were quite clear in their interviews that if they separated from their husbands or their husbands abandoned them, their sons were lost to them. They were usually left to take care of their daughters, and husbands who abandoned their wives also abandoned their daughters.

Another way in which the son preference works to control women in a relationship is through the continued pregnancies that women undergo in order to have a son. These forms of control are not just exerted by the husband, but from the entire family system, both marital and natal. Given the strong son-preference tradition, some women in my study were forced to bear children in the hopes of begetting a son. Many of the women, whether

experiencing violence or not, were very keen to use birth control or any form of contraception to stop their reproductive abilities, but were unable to do so until they produced a son for their husbands or their marital families.

I: Because you have come out of the joint family?

DV073 (NV): Yes. My in-laws had a joint family. When I had two daughters, the first thing I wanted was to get family planning operation done. But my parents-in-law opposed me and said that I must give them a son. Then at that time they started saying that they would get their son married again... and things like that.... And then I had a third daughter. When this daughter was born I started crying and I cried a lot. I said that I didn't want to [continue].

Women were often beaten if they used contraceptive methods without the knowledge of their husbands (Clark 2000, Daga et al. 1998, Duvvury et al. 2004). This insistence on having more children because of son preference often became an additional burden on the family, especially for households with limited financial resources. This became problematic when women were abandoned by their husbands. In one instance, a woman who had given birth to six daughters was left fending for her daughters alone after her husband abandoned her after the birth of a son and took her son to his village. Children also played a heavy role in marital relationships when women wanted to have children, and their husbands refused.

I: Then what happened?

DV076 (IT): The baby was aborted. I went because he asked me to go. He said that he wanted the baby and so I should go to the clinic. After reaching there he didn't want it. But only I know how God has given me these two kids.

Although these instances were a minority (four women), women told us that they were duped into having abortions. If women insisted on having children, they were harassed and if they were separated from their husbands, were denied any form of child support. Thus,

women were particularly vulnerable to the ways in which husbands used children to control their lives.

ISOLATION

One of the most evocative themes that emerged from women's narratives was the sense of isolation that women experienced in their homes. Women talked extensively about the restrictions that they faced immediately after the marriage and complained about the inability of their husbands or their marital families to trust them. This control tactic was mostly used by intimate terrorists, although not exclusively. Three women in my study who had not experienced any violence reported feeling very isolated in their marital homes. One of the predominant methods of isolation was the close monitoring of every social interaction that women had, even with individuals who came to the door. This was particularly difficult for women who had to go out of the house to work.

DV009 (IT): He used to quarrel about my going out. Even if I go out, staying with someone overnight was not allowed. Else, he would quarrel. He used to burn my sarees. If I didn't come on time, he used to burn my clothes, belongings, utensils etc.

In other cases, most of these restrictions took the form of keeping women inside their homes, prohibiting them from moving outside their homes at all. In these cases, women were not allowed to cultivate friends or talk to their neighbors. In the next example, DV026 was locked inside the house from the first day of her marriage and the only way she was able to get out of the house was when her father and brother came to visit her.

I: Sometimes when you went out, did he try to find out who was with you?

DV026 (IT): He didn't let me out alone. If someone came to take me to my parents' home, then I had to go along with them and come back when someone from my in-laws place came there to bring me back. Never alone.

Part of the reason for the close monitoring of women when they traveled to their natal homes comes from specific cultural restrictions. As per local custom in the village as well as the urban slum, women were allowed to go back to the natal families only for specific family functions, festivals, or other important occasions like the birth of the first child. The head of the marital family, either her husband, father-in-law, or mother-in-law had to give expressed consent in order for her to travel. These visits could not be undertaken alone. In addition, decorum restricted her from coming back to the house without her husband's consent.

Although this was a normal practice for most women in the sample, for women experiencing intimate terrorism, this communication was wrought with problems. Women were often at the mercy of their husband's authority and whims. Hence, if intimate terrorists decided not to pick their wives up from their natal homes, there was very little women could do. These women were additionally restricted by social customs coupled with any physical restrictions their husbands or marital families might place upon them. Most of the time, women, regardless of whether they experienced violence or not, were quite clear on the restrictions placed upon them, and did not question it.

I: You don't go or you don't have permission to go?

DV022 (IT): No, I don't go out anywhere. There's no question about going out. If everything that I need has been taken care of, then I don't need to go out at all.

It is only when the restrictions seemed unreasonable or were traced to their husband's excessive control that they expressed resentment. In an extreme example of this isolation from the outside world, the husband refused to let the woman be alone for any extended periods of time, giving her very little space to do her household duties in the home.

DV006 (IT): Even if my brother-in-law was just walking along the road, my husband used to say that I was looking at him, trying to

speaking with him. He didn't allow me to go out of the house. He used to lock me up at home and he used to just sit next to me. 'She should not go anywhere, should not talk to anyone' – saying so, he used to keep drinking and just sitting there.

As the example indicates, it is not just outsiders that women were isolated from. In extreme cases of intimate terrorism, even members of the joint family household were not available for social interaction. This usually happened in the context of a larger web of patriarchal control. In most cases of intimate terrorism that were situated in the joint family system, many of the marital family members monitored and controlled (occasionally by force) women's movements within the house. In these situations, the sense of isolation that the women experienced was not one of isolation from everybody, but specifically isolation from allies. Given the cultural norms that exist in these high-control marital homes, women were never alone, yet the sense of isolation they felt was often quite profound. Women who were perceived to step outside the bounds of propriety could be 'chastened' by other members of the household, as you witness in the following example:

DV020 (IT): [His] brother beat me for no reason at all. I was standing in a narrow passage. I was newly married then. My husband hadn't come home. So, I was waiting for him. There was an elderly lady who asked me, 'Hasn't your husband come home yet?' Then I said 'No'. My daughter wasn't born then. His brother came and slapped me and asked me, 'Why are you standing here in this passage?'

The dimensions of isolation are not just restricted to women being left alone, but who they were left alone with. Therefore, in intimate terrorism, the characteristic of isolation is not just about restricting women's movements, or to literally isolate them, but also to maintain their sense of isolation even in the midst of an extended marital family network.

MINIMIZING, BLAMING, AND DENYING

One of the characteristics of intimate terrorism is that the violence and control escalates over time. In the cycle of violence, men initially make excuses, deny, or blame the

violence on other factors. They tend to ‘sweet talk’ their way out of the responsibility for the violence, usually blaming the woman for ‘provoking’ the violence. As time goes on, there tends to be an escalation of control and violence and with it, the husband tends to shift the responsibility and blame squarely onto the wife (Pence & Paymar 1993). This pattern is also seen in my data, and this proves to be an especially powerful tool in the Indian context. In the light of fairly permissive attitudes towards domestic violence in general³, women experiencing intimate terrorism accept responsibility and blame if they violate their social roles (e.g., if they don’t take adequate care of their family or are rude to their marital family members). In this atmosphere, it is not hard to see that husbands often contribute to this assignment of blame. In the following example and in other examples, women were often beaten or verbally abused not necessarily for their own actions, but for the actions of their natal families.

DV066 (IT): Yes. But that he [shouted and screamed] only when we were at home. My parents-in-law used to be there. Then afterwards I used to ask him why he spoke in that manner? Then his reply used to be something like this-“Then what was the need for your brother and sisters to come here? They are rich. You are not to go with them. That’s it. I don’t like it.”

In addition, most men in the study, even in cases of situational couple violence, didn’t bother to deny or give specific reasons for their use of violence. Even in non-violent happy families, we found that men’s marital role did not include accountability to their wives. Given that there did not seem to be any marital expectations on the part of women (even for women experiencing no violence) that he would be accountable, men did not invest in minimizing or denying their control or violence because they rarely gained anything by doing it. However, there were a few exceptions.

³ The mean for endorsing domestic violence in six scenarios is 2.97 for women experiencing no violence, as compared with 3.76 for women experiencing situational couple violence and 3.39 for women experiencing intimate terrorism.

DV004 (SCV): I said the same thing to him. ‘This year, you beat me twice. Why did you do it? You could have explained it to me nicely’. He said, ‘No, Now you will not repeat the mistake. I have told you once that you should not talk. Now you will not speak again...Now that you are staying with your in-laws, then you need to control yourself and not talk in front of them.’

In this particular example, given the violence was not a frequent occurrence; the husband was quite explicit about the reasons for the violence. As you can see, most of it involves blaming DV004 for the violence and diminishing his own responsibility. In addition, he is also quite explicit about the ways in which she should behave in order to avoid any future incidents of violence, thereby laying the groundwork for blaming her if she transgresses her ‘boundaries’.

While women did take on the blame for some of the violence, most women were able to see that the violence was likely to happen again regardless of their behavior. This was especially true for women experiencing intimate terrorism.

DV024 (IT): Two months. First eight days, he was good. He didn’t drink or anything. After days, he started abusing me again. ‘I lost my cycle because of you, the conductor beat me because of you, I had to face a lot of trouble because of you, your brother harassed me’. He used to dig up one excuse or the other and beat me. When he comes here now, he asks ‘Did I beat you in those first eight days? Tell me’. And then he beat me again. If I say something then, immediately he started beating hard. If I kept quiet, then he threatened me and asked me to repeatedly say something.

In this example, we see that the cycle of violence that was previously documented in the Duluth model (Pence & Paymar 1993) is quite evident in the Indian context as well. As the violence and control progressed, men found very trivial reasons to beat their wives, eventually wasting no efforts in explaining why they were being violent. As a result, most of the women we interviewed who had experienced intimate terrorism for a long time never gave us any specific reason for the violence. They either identified that the violence

happened for no reason, or they were unaware that the ‘real’ reason for the violence was that their husbands were violent and controlling.

INTIMIDATION and COERCION AND THREATS

In the model of controlling tactics that was conceptualized by Pence & Paymar (1993), using intimidation and using coercion and threats are considered separate entities that work with each other to imprison women in their web of violence. In other studies, it has been documented that the very definition of intimidation involves the use of coercion and threats. If a husband makes a threat and follows up on it, the mere mention of it afterwards intimidates women into following their husband’s orders. In this study as well, it was very difficult to piece apart the separate effects of intimidation and threats, mostly because they worked in conjunction with each other. This was the case for most of the women experiencing intimate terrorism. As with other studies, most of the threats that were issued to intimidate women were not empty ones.

DV009 (IT): Two times he burnt my good clothes. When I didn’t come on time, he said I’m dead to him and burnt my clothes. Twice, he put kerosene over me and hence, I lost all my faith. If he lights up the fire, what can I do? Where will my kids go?

For most women experiencing intimate terrorism, one of the reasons that these threats worked was because the results were often unpredictable. Given that women were beaten for many reasons, and there was a climate of intimidation, women often walked a very thin line between pleasing and ‘disturbing’ their husbands. This hyper-vigilance is characteristic of intimate terrorism (Menjivar & Salcido 2002). However, there were five women experiencing situational couple violence who also reported hyper-vigilance.

I: Even today [after 3 years of no violent incidents], you cannot predict what he might do when he comes home drunk?

DV052 (SCV): Yes, I can't be sure. If I go somewhere and sit quietly then he keeps quiet. But I keep sitting in front of him, then he starts a fight. He literally digs up a fight.

In this case, DV052 literally was immobile with fear. She rarely went anywhere, restricted her interactions with her neighbors and friends and was very conscious of her husband's desires. However, when we asked about whether her husband indulged in any of the control characteristics, she said that he was no longer controlling in any of those ways. I would argue that in these cases, women were so effectively controlled by the mere threat of violence that husbands rarely had to use any of the controlling tactics.

But for women experiencing intimate terrorism, they reported living in fear, partly because they had seen the threats come to fruition and partly because the threats were extremely explicit.

DV014 (IT): And once he goes to the village, he said 'I will beat you so terribly that your people won't be able to recognize your face. It is what we do with the snake. Even if we kill a snake, we are not sure that it is dead and so we keep on beating it. That's what I am going to do with you'. And I am afraid to go to the village for this reason.

With these forms of explicit death-threats, men not only restricted women physically, but also psychologically.

As I mentioned before, women who have been experiencing intimate terrorism for a long time are rarely given any explicit reasons by their husbands that explain the violence. Women experiencing intimate terrorism, and occasionally women experiencing situational couple violence, were often invested in understanding the reasons behind the violence, partly to regain some control over their lives and partly to avoid future incidents of violence. But women experiencing intimate terrorism often realized that while the threats and the intimidation are quite real, they can't really accept all the responsibility for the violence.

DV014 (IT): [In response to her mother's comment about DV014 making a mistake] Mistake! Means only my mistakes are pointed out

and told to my people. And he convinces them so well that they all scold me. But these are crafty things – it is not right to tell you those.

While some women experiencing intimate terrorism realize that the violence is not necessarily related to their ‘mistake, they have very limited options if they want to respond. This was also true for a few women experiencing situational couple violence. For example, DV052 was quite aware that she was not responsible for the violence, but there was very little that she could do to change the power dynamic. .

DV052 (SCV): I felt very bad. Of course, there is a difference. The very first time I felt that he had beaten me with no fault of mine. I wanted to go back to my father’s house. But then I thought that my son is very young, where and how could I go with my child? Then I just kept quiet.

And by keeping quiet and believing the reasons that her husband gives her, women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism are able to construct a story that gives them some power in the violent situation.

There are some psychological consequences for women when they start to reconstruct their story to match their husband’s stories. They are more likely to be depressed and express feeling helpless in their relationship. This was mostly true for women experiencing intimate terrorism. If leaving the relationship is not feasible, many women experiencing intimate terrorism choose to cope with their highly controlled environments by denying or readjusting their frame of mind to suit their husband.

USE OF ALCOHOL

The use of alcohol has historically been one of the primary lenses through which domestic violence has been viewed by Indian researchers. Almost of the Indian data regarding domestic violence points to the use of alcohol as a primary reason for violence (ICRW 1998, Johnson & Johnson 2001, Kelkar 1992). In fact, some of the state laws instituted prohibition for brief periods of time in response to pressure by women’s groups

who argued that the violence would stop when the alcohol consumption would (Pande 2000). Many of the women in the study also echoed these sentiments.

I: Do you fight quite a lot sometimes?

DV074 (SCV): Not when he is sober. Only when he drinks; he starts a fight.

I: But do you have a fight every time he drinks?

DV074 (SCV): Yes.

While alcohol has been linked to violent behavior in other, non-domestic contexts, I would argue that using alcohol to account for all forms of domestic violence would be a mistake and a disservice to women experiencing the effects of alcoholism and domestic violence.

Women experiencing violence were astute in understanding that the alcohol issues are intimately related to other issues such as financial resources. For example, most of the women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism identified that the alcohol-induced arguments were mostly related to money. In addition, some women identified that most of the beating was instrumental: men wanted women to provide them with money to buy alcohol and when they didn't, they used violence to extract money.

I: But then what triggers his beating? Something happens and then he beats-that must be the process?

DV030 (IT): No, if I don't give him money, then he beats. If I don't give him money for drinking or chewing tobacco, then he beats me.

Other researchers have also identified that the domestic violence is related to alcohol though socio-economic status (Pande 2000, Poonacha & Pandey 1999, Report 1999). They postulate that men use alcohol as an escape from their economic worries and the drinking enables them to vent their frustrations on their wives. At the same time, all violence that involves drinking is not necessarily about control. The way to understand the difference comes from the women's understanding of it.

Situational couple violence and alcohol

A number of men in the sample (n=8) who consumed alcohol did not control their wives actively. In fact, they were extremely negligent of their families and were ostracized in their communities for being chronic drunkards and for being bad fathers and husbands.

DV007 (SCV): He simply doesn't bother with [money matters], so I need to look in all such matters. Even right now, he is drunk. He never goes anywhere. He is only concerned with his food and his drinking... He stays awake for whole night. He keeps on talking continuously. We eat dinner and go to sleep. What can we do? It's not a once in a six-month or a year. If it's a daily matter, we get fed up.

In response, many of the women refused to part with their household money to fund their husband's drinking. Men often became violent at the refusal to feed their addiction. For example, according to the typology, DV007 is experiencing situational couple violence. But the violence that she experiences resembles the repetitive and chronic nature of intimate terrorism. This example illustrates a critical aspect of Johnson's typology: While situational couple violence generally is not characterized by chronic and severe violence, the violence is not defined by the particular characteristics of the violence. The typology is not based on severity or even frequency of violence; instead, it is based on the generalized patterns of control that families wield on women.

Many women experiencing situational couple violence saw the violent incident as an aberrant event. These women, who were not married to chronic drunkards, argued that the violence that they experienced was never repeated when the men were not intoxicated, and in most cases, the husbands were repentant afterwards.

DV004 (SCV): Yes. And he doesn't drink anything else but Officer's Choice which costs Rs.55. He brings it home and drinks. He doesn't say anything to me after drinking. When he is sober, he talks to me. Because he says that when anyone talks in a drunken state, then people can find faults in his speech and say that he said that in a drunken state. But he doesn't get mad at me. Always talks lovingly and in a jolly way.

We see that there is some variation with regard to husbands who abused alcohol. There were some drunkards who did not control their wives *as long as they had ready access to alcohol*. But there were other husbands who were chronic drunkards who manipulated their wives regardless of their alcohol consumption. For them, alcohol was not about letting go of control, but about gaining it.

Intimate terrorism and use of alcohol

A remarkable number of women were astute at seeing that when their husband came home drunk, his intention was solely to find an excuse to beat his wife.

DV067 (IT): There is no specific reason Sometimes it is money. Sometimes it is “You didn’t bring this or you didn’t bring that.” Now I don’t have parents so from where am I going to bring things? He scolds me because of that. If he is stressed out because of something which has happened outside then he releases that anger on me.

While financial resources were often stated as the primary reason for the use of alcohol-induced violence, many of the women experiencing intimate terrorism did not have any access to financial resources. Nevertheless, they were subject to violence whenever their husbands were drunk. Women experiencing situational couple violence who had negligent drunkard husbands were disillusioned and tired of taking care of their families by themselves, but women whose husbands were controlling drunkards were usually scared of their husband’s temper and were very wary of him when he was drunk.

These women were quick to identify that while they did experience violence whether their husbands were drunk or not, the violence tended to be more severe when alcohol was involved. This is because the repercussions for interrupting and disturbing the husband in his intoxicated state were swift and severe. Most of the horrific acts of violence happened during these drunken episodes.

DV076 (IT): Then he started fighting all the time, beating all the time, tie up my hands and legs, he used to put a rod here, tie me up

with a rough jute string, put a gag in my mouth, and then beat me up. I didn't tell anyone because of my self respect.

Another characteristic that separated these different kinds of violence is that with the controlling drunkard (IT), marital family members often acted as agents or instigators of violence so that women reported experiencing more violence from their drunk husbands if their mother-in-law or sister-in-law had specific complaints against them. Even when family members heard the violence, they rarely intervened. In sharp contrast, a woman dealing with a negligent drunkard (SCV) tended to have some allies:

I: In all these 18 years, means the 8 years that you stayed with him and now, he never had a job?

DV026 (SCV): Never. My father-in-law always bore all the household expenses. Even when he worked, he could not manage to meet his own expenses, drinking, and drugs. Even when he worked for a few days, he could not meet his expenses.

In another example, a woman experiencing alcohol-induced situational couple violence approached the police to take her husband to the police station. In addition, she successfully petitioned her neighbors into shaming her husband so that he was sober for a few days.

Alcohol acted more as a magnifier of the existing situations that were at hand. Even in cases where the husband was a chronic drunkard and used violence repeatedly, the consequences for women differed enormously depending on the control context in which the violence was experienced. Thus, not only should distinctions be made with regard to control contexts, the differential impacts of these contexts should also be examined thoroughly.

CONTROL TACTICS SPECIFIC TO THE INDIAN CONTEXT

The control tactics discussed so far are similar to the control tactics that are used by men in the United States, as well as the United Kingdom (Graham-Kevan & Archer 2001, Holtzworth-Munroe et al. 1997a, Holtzworth-Munroe et al. 1997b, Menjivar & Salcido

2002). However, I found that there were some factors particular to the Indian context that are highly pertinent to understand the relationship between patriarchal structure and domestic violence in India.

FAMILY CONTEXT: FAMILY STRUCTURE

One of the central ways to study the differential impact of control and cultural contexts is to examine in detail the family dynamics that are produced in interaction with these contexts. A central lens through which to study the family context is the family structure within which this domestic abuse is produced. This is hard to do because the subtle dynamics within the family rarely show up clearly in a single interview. Despite this problem, a single interview can provide a small window into the intricate ways in which family structure affects the dynamics of violence in the home. From the quantitative data, we see that women are much more likely to experience violence when they are situated in nuclear families in the Indian sample (DHS India), and in joint families in the fieldwork data. This contradictory finding is further complicated when we examine the narratives of the women in the sample.

Several women, experiencing both situational couple violence and intimate terrorism, pointed to the presence of other family members as the primary reason for the violence. But for both situational couple violence and intimate terrorism, the presence of other family members had varied implications. To simplify the analyses, I will examine the role of family structure in intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in three ways: (1) family structure and arguments, (2) family-instigated violence, and (3) family as support.

Family structure and arguments

One of the main ways in which additional family members influenced the dynamics of any marital relationship (violent or not) was through their physical presence. Many of the

women were living in very cramped quarters because of their socioeconomic status. In one case, a family of 17 was living in a two-room (not a two bedroom) apartment with each room about 150 square feet. The financial burden as well as the physical strain of managing so many individuals in very limited quarters added a dimension of stress to the marital relationship. Often times, the conflict within the household arose because of women's insistence on leaving the joint household to form her own household. Some of the women were successful, and some were not.

DV070 (IT): The reasons change. Sometimes, he says that I am stubborn. And he can't do the things I say. He can't leave his job and so on. Even his mother said yesterday, when we had a fight that I should leave home and that I cannot stay there. She asked both of us to leave. But then he was arguing about it and asking me where can we go, we cannot anywhere else because he cannot afford it etc. So, every time, the reasons are different.

Yet, the physical move from the household did not always solve problems or resolve the tension. The bonds of family structure transcended physical presence. In the following example, while DV028's mother-in-law was not living in the household, there still remained some considerable tension (although no violence) in the household.

DV028 (NV): Father-in-law expired. Mother-in-law is there. But I don't get along with my mother-in-law. She stays with the younger brother-in-law. My mother-in-law and I just hate each other.

One of the reasons for this tension is that the husband is most likely to be the main contributing member of the joint family household. So, the departure of the main source of income to another household is not likely to be taken very lightly by the joint family household. This sense of betrayal often followed the couple if they formed a nuclear family.

Thus, presence of other family members or the extended family structure often acted as a backdrop against which much of the violence or control dynamics of a marital relationship was enacted. For example, most of the women who experienced alcohol-

induced situational couple violence identified the presence of more individuals in the household as the source of violence. This is because the presence of the other family members in the family structure leads to an abdication of responsibility on the part of the husband. Because the maintenance of the joint family household is usually distributed among many members, many negligent drunk husbands took advantage of the structure of the family to abandon their wives, physically, emotionally, or financially.

Family-instigated violence

In addition to the presence of other family members, the *influence* of other family members in marital conflicts should not be understated. In many of the interviews that I had with individuals who had experienced intimate terrorism, and occasionally situational couple violence, the violence was sometimes perpetrated at the instigation of the marital family. A woman experiencing intimate terrorism told us that she loved her husband and if she could live away from her marital family with her husband, she was confident that he would never beat her. This confidence is also observed in cases (4) where women had experienced violence from their extended family members, but not from their husbands.

DV011 (NV): No, never. Never felt irritated. We had fights about the farm, but that was between my brother-in-law and me. But my husband does not drink, does not gamble, does not go to sex workers, so we never fight.

But not all women experiencing intimate terrorism were confident that a change in the living arrangement would have an effect on the control dynamics. Many women reported that family networks (rather than living arrangements) tended to be toxic because they compounded a high-control context and consequently affected the violence that was perpetrated by husbands. For example, in the unique household that DV070 was living in, all three daughter-in-laws had experienced severe harassment from their mother-in-law. Even though the mother-in-law lived approximately two hours away from the household that

DV070 inhabited, she held most of the control and power of the household. Her rhetoric about the ‘utility’ of wives heavily influenced the way the husbands acted.

DV070 (IT): My mother-in-law rules. She influences them and advises them to do whatever they want to do outside and adds that wives have been brought into our own home only for the night (pleasure in bed). She tells them that they have to take care of only the ‘night’, and then they can do whatever they wanted, otherwise.

As a result, at least two of the daughter-in-laws had separated from the household. When we interviewed the second daughter-in-law, we found that the control tactics used by the husbands as well as the rhetoric that they spouted was very similar. Thus, the family structure across separate households had a direct influence on the relationship between patriarchal control and domestic violence. While the previous example is an extreme case, most of the women who were experiencing intimate terrorism pointed to their extended family members as instigators for their experience of violence.

DV005 (IT): I think my mother-in-law and sister-in-law tell tales about me. Then he vents his anger on me. He says, ‘As soon as I enter home, my mother and sister tell me so many things. Where can I then vent my anger? So, I beat my wife’.

The narratives involving situational couple violence differed from these narratives. For example, even when women experiencing situational couple violence pointed to other family members as the main reason they were assaulted, they were quick to see that the husband was often ‘compelled’ or ‘obliged’ to hit them. These women were also the ones who insisted that the violence would end if they moved away from the vicinity of their extended family networks. In the example below, the conflict arose primarily because of the recent entry of the in-laws into the nuclear household, leading to conflict between the husband and the mother-in-law. So, for the first time in 10 years, the husband came home drunk and hit his wife.

I: What time was it when this happened?

DV004 (SCV): 10:30 or 11:00 pm. He comes home late from work. When he came, there was the same argument. Why he got more mad was because his parents cursed him and then took out his anger on me as I talked.

In some contrast, many women experiencing intimate terrorism told us that the instigation from extended family members was often an ‘excuse’ to beat their wives.

DV021 (IT): Yes. These people used to tell him, and sometimes when he was drunk, he used to beat me. You haven’t prepared the vegetables well, you haven’t cooked properly and something abusive like this, he used to say.

In addition, some of the violence that women in intimate terrorism experienced was independent of the complaints that were given to the husband from the extended family members.

The differences in the instigation from family members, of course, lay in the pattern of generalized control that women were experiencing. I found that while there were some cases of intimate terrorism where women were experiencing violence only because of the presence of other family members, this was rarely the case. The primary actor in controlling the woman was the husband. This was not necessarily the case with women experiencing situational couple violence. While the family dynamic or the family structure might be quite toxic to the women, the marital relationship was not characterized by the systematic use of control by the husband, as it was in relationships of intimate terrorism.

I: When your husband started beating you, did someone intervene to stop him, to help you?

DV021 (IT): No, nobody came to help. On the contrary, my mother-in-law used to say ‘Go on! Beat her!’

While this is an extreme case, there was some consensus in the qualitative data that suggested that instigation by the extended marital family was considered a primary source of violence for women experiencing intimate terrorism. But since we do not have a measure of

control exhibited by the extended family members, no definitive statements can be made. In many cases of intimate terrorism, the additional family members became not just the instigators of violence, but also participants.

DV021 (IT): My sister-in-law [also] beat me for no reason at all. She thought we should buy new clothes for her, pamper her and look after her well...making ends meet was difficult for us. So how could we spend for her? But she used to say, 'you must ask me and do it according to my wishes'. So she beat me.

The violence in the household, in this and in other cases, was often enacted to serve the hierarchical social structure of the patriarchal household.

Family as support

While women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence identified the additional members and the family structure as major contributing factors in their experience of violence, they also turned to their marital and natal families for support. Often the extended family network was opposed to the use of violence. When I examined help-seeking behavior, I found that many women went to their in-laws (mother-in-law, brother-in-law) to ask them to help stop the violence. In one case in which the husband was a drug addict as well as a gambling addict, the mother-in-law protected the woman from abuse and advised her to live separately with her son so that the husband may not adversely influence her grandson's education. This familial support was seen in cases of intimate terrorism as well as situational couple violence.

I- What did you do immediately after he beat you?

DV076 (IT)-Then I used to tell my mother-in-law. She used to try to tell him not to beat. But he used to say "She is my wife. I will beat her. It is none of your business." He never listened to anybody.

In another example:

I: What do his parents and brother have to say about his suspicion?

DV079 (SCV): Many a times my husband was also beaten up. The younger brother would beat the elder one. I mean my brother in law had beaten my husband because my husband suspected me and because he had beaten me. All three of my in-laws support me.

In these cases, the family is very supportive of women experiencing violence and emotional and financial abuse. In one poignant case, a woman talked about her in-laws becoming an anchor not only in dealing with her alcoholic, addicted and gambling husband, but also in taking care of her son's education and her finances.

This runs counter to much of the literature about in-law relations (Leonard 1979, Mies 1980, Miller 1999, Preisser 1999) as well as popular notions about the relationship of mother-in-law to the daughter-in-law. In fact, based on the power dynamics that characterize the hierarchical family structure in India, mother-in-laws tend to get depicted as cruel women who are set on tormenting their daughter-in-laws. The accompanying family narrative demonizes daughter-in-laws as selfish women who break up the happy joint family to create their own personal fiefdom. The truth, however, lies in the moderation of the stereotype.

I found that some women, whether mother-in-laws or daughter-in-laws, did fit the stereotypes. Some of the violence, whether intimate terrorism or situational couple violence, was definitely instigated by the mother-in-law. In addition, the power and control that the women were struggling over was quite real and had an impact on their lives on a day-to-day basis. However, to demonize either one would be tantamount to blaming the victim. Upon closer inspection, we find that very few mother-in-laws had absolute power to dictate over their daughter-in-laws. Most of the power still lay with the husband.

Therefore, the vilification of the figure of mother-in-law as well as the assumed acceptability of violence should be closely examined. There clearly are cases in which the violence is not supported by the extended family network. For example, six women reported

that their families used physical force against their husbands in response to his assaults. In these cases, the women were able to find a safe space in the marital household, despite the controlling tactics used by the husband.

The stereotype about the extended family structure being an alien (and by extension) unfriendly place was not universally true. While most women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence were ambivalent about the influence of other family members in their lives, some of them were quite happy with living in joint families.

MARITAL CONTEXT

While family context is central to understanding the marital relationship, it is sometimes more important to examine the individual marital context. This is especially significant because it is against this marital context that most acts of violence, whether situational couple violence or intimate terrorism, are played out. Thus, the interaction between the individuals in the marriage is one of the most important ways of examining how power, control, and violence are related within the marital relationship.

Marital happiness

When we examine the quantitative data (see Table 9 in Chapter 4), we find that couples experiencing no violence report more happiness than women experiencing situational couple violence or intimate terrorism. This is to be expected; women are more likely to be happy when they are not experiencing violence. But there is a characteristic difference between couples experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. This is reflected in the qualitative data as well. We can compare reports of happiness from a woman not experiencing any violence:

I: In a month's time, how many days are there when everything is going on nicely?

DV019 (NV): All the days are nice. We never fight. My husband is very nice. I am very lucky.

to a woman experiencing situational couple violence:

I: How happy are you in this marriage?

DV004 (SCV): I am extremely happy and I will always be so because there is nothing to be unhappy about. I will always smile like this and I will be happy.

As shown in these examples, most women who experience situational couple violence tend to talk about the quality of their marriage in remarkably similar ways as women experiencing no violence. While women experiencing situational couple violence do experience some dissatisfaction with their marriage, they do not differ a lot from women who experience no violence. In fact, it would be a misrepresentation to say that women who experienced no violence were always happy with their husbands in all respects. There were some women who had not experienced any violence who were not very happy with their husbands. Similarly, there were some women who were experiencing situational couple violence who were quite happy with their husbands. This was not true for women experiencing intimate terrorism:

I: When you look back, how happy were you with the marriage?

DV009 (IT): No, he started drinking. I am neither happy by seeing him nor knowing him. Now I have daughter, granddaughter. Why should I please him? Now I will be suffering this till my death.

This was a fairly typical response for women who were experiencing intimate terrorism. Most of them talked about feeling trapped in the relationship without any chance of escape. They had no hope that the violence would end and they often expressed anger or sadness about the situation. In addition, many women experiencing intimate terrorism reported feeling sad, helpless, angry and sometimes resigned at the state of their marriage.

Marital communication

Establishment of clear and honest communication is one cornerstone of a good marital relationship. Women experiencing intimate terrorism expressed that this aspect of a marital relationship was often missing.

I: Or he might be saying something to you?

DV036 (IT): No, nothing of that sort. He fell short of time talking to his mother, then when would he have time for me?

As mentioned in the earlier section, women experiencing intimate terrorism often talked about feeling lonely in their marriages and found themselves without any means of communicating with their husbands. In addition, women often found that their attempts to rectify the situation fell on deaf ears. Their efforts at improving marital quality were often thwarted by their husbands, and as a result they often felt alienated from their husbands. For some women experiencing intimate terrorism, even these marital arguments that are quite common in happy or unhappy relationships were completely absent. In these cases, we find women rarely report marital discord. Their husbands refuse to participate in any conflict resolution because of their lack of investment in the marital relationship.

DV024 (IT): I immediately – means we did not ever go out or things like that. He was married before. So, he didn't pay any attention to me.

Marital communication was not wrought with problems for women experiencing situational couple violence. Not only were they able to communicate with their partners, they were also able to state their needs and expectations.

I: What are the things that you ask for?

DV004 (SCV): I say only this, 'Get the house done properly. Let us get kitchen platform made. Then get things like mixer, TV etc'. He says once the house is done, he would do everything properly. Sometimes, there are petty quarrels for these reasons. Not about anything else. We argue a little bit, but he listens to me.

And this willingness to listen is one of the primary characteristics of situational couple violence that differentiates it from intimate terrorism. To understand more clearly the marital and familial context of a violent relationship, we can turn to the ways in which women conceptualize their familial and marital social roles.

FAMILY AND MARITAL SOCIAL ROLE

While the different social roles of a woman are constantly at play in any situation, women experiencing violence invoked many aspects of their social and familial roles as a wife, mother, or a daughter-in-law to explain their marital life. For example, women were quite explicit about their understanding of what a ‘good’ wife should be. This was sometimes displayed in the justifications that women provided for the existence of violence.

I: What had happened?

DV077 (SCV): I wasn’t talking nicely to his mother. When I wasn’t talking to his mother then he had beaten me. I wasn’t listening to her. And that’s why he had beaten me. It was my mistake.

In many instances, women experiencing violence pointed to the ways in which they were not fulfilling social roles that were ascribed to them. In this instance, the violence was justified primarily because she did not fulfill her role as a good daughter-in-law. For women who were experiencing intimate terrorism, the rules regarding this social role were malleable and constantly changed by their husbands.

DV024 (IT): I behave the way he wants me to. I look after the household and cooking – everything. What mistake can I make for which he would beat me then? I could not cook well in the beginning. I could not make chapattis. And sometimes, couldn’t prepare the vegetable properly. He didn’t like it and because of it, he used to get angry.

One of the most common reasons for the assault reported by women experiencing intimate terrorism was their ‘supposed’ inability to cook. The importance of cooking in marital relationships (whether violent or not) cannot be underestimated. In fact, a lot of information

can be gleaned from the way in which women were welcomed into the kitchen, and this was often an indicator of the marital and familial life in the household. For example, women talked about the ways in which they were trained to be good wives and daughter-in-laws by their marital and natal family.

DV072 (NV): I didn't know how to cook on a Chula [a cooking stove on which one cooks using natural firewood]. My father had given me everything needed for my household, but this house didn't have proper electricity fittings. It was all temporary fitting...my mother in law used to say "This girl has come to our village from such a far off place, from a city and she is staying with us for my son's sake, then I must take care of her."

One of the reasons for this extensive training is because for a young bride, especially in joint families, even small mistakes take on great importance. The strictness with which these social rules are applied varies greatly. For example, in the case of DV072, the mother-in-law was helpful in making sure that the wife was able to understand the rules of the house and perform her duties accordingly. But in many controlling families, mother-in-laws sabotaged the efforts of the daughter-in-laws to be good wives and daughters-in-law. They did this by complaining about the woman's incompetence to her husband, or by directly interfering in their duties so that they were not able to fulfill them. In these households, women were most likely to be restricted and most likely to be physically assaulted not only by their husbands, but also by other members of the marital household.

DV005 (IT): If I called [mother-in-law] for dinner/lunch, she didn't come and then used to say that I don't give her food. When I finished cooking, she used to grind chilies and keep the ground ball of chilies. Then she used to tell my husband that your wife grinds chilies everyday. Then he used to beat me.

The extended family network, including the natal family also is implicated in the creation and maintaining of this social role through the use of control and violence. As mentioned before, instruction in the duties of a good wife and a good member of the marital

household is often given by the wife's natal family. Therefore, the justification and the endorsement of the use of violence by the husband are often echoed in the natal family.

DV020 (IT): I used to talk to my mother and say 'I don't know whether he would be a good husband'. But my mother used to say 'husbands are like that. He will improve'. But I never felt that our marriage would not last.

This often traps women experiencing intimate terrorism into thinking that the cause of the violence lies truly in the execution of their prescribed social roles as defined by their marital families. This rejection of women's understanding of the controlling situation by the extended family network creates a conflict for many women.

Many women (n=23) in the study pointed out that while they did not think that what they were experiencing was right, they also believed that it was quite normal to experience some amount of control and violence. The construction of this social role thus helped to reconcile any contradictions women might experience when confronted with violence. For example, when we asked DV075 about the contradiction between her statement that she was very happy and the fact that she had experienced some violence, she replied:

DV075 (IT): You see, it is like this: we got married, then had children. We had children and then they got married. Now [in this process] some fights are inevitable. He doesn't drink nor eat non-vegetarian food. But I don't work fast enough and then there is delay in everything. So we have fights.

While DV075 was experiencing high levels of control exerted by her husband, she was able to use the social roles of both husband and wife to help her cope with the situation by constructing a story that normalized these high levels of violence and control. This normalization of violence and control by their marital and natal families, and often by the women themselves has some serious implications for the abuse that they suffered at the hands of their husbands.

DV076 (IT): Then he started fighting all the time, beating all the time, tie up my hands and legs, he used to put a rod here, tie me up

with a rough jute string, put a gag in my mouth, and then beat me up. I didn't tell anyone because of my self respect.

Since one of the duties of a good wife is her quality of forbearance, women are often socialized not to tell anyone about the violence that they experience. In fact, many of the women commented that the first time they were talking about the violence was during the interview.

This culture of silence is a little different from what we know of intimate terrorism in Western contexts. In the U.S. and in other countries, intimate terrorism often elicits a conspiracy of shame and silence that traps women in the relationship. While this silencing is also prevalent in the Indian context, the social roles of a good Indian woman further complicate this culture of shame and silence in intimate terrorism. This is because women are often put in danger for jeopardizing the prestige of the entire family. Since women are often considered to embody the honor of the family, the very act of talking or venturing out of a prescribed social role in any minor way can create situations of violence. By complaining, she does not just put the family to shame, she also puts herself in harm's way.

DV014 (IT): I cannot even tell you how many times they have kicked me during the last ten years. When you talk to them in person, then you will come to know. But their appearance is quite different – you can't make out that these people must be beating by looking at them. They look quite docile. The village people feel they are docile. I stand out because I talk openly. The whole village says that this woman talks...

In this culture of silence, women rarely are able to point out the duplicity that is stated so clearly by DV014. In addition, women were often trapped in the confines of their social roles, not only as a good wife or daughter-in-law, but also what is considered to be a good 'woman'.

DV071 (IT): He used to follow me everyday to the shop where I worked. If he follows me in this manner then people will think that this woman (that's me) is not a good woman. That's why her husband has

to follow her everywhere. And if I tell others the truth then they would take disadvantage of the situation. Then in addition to this he told everyone at my workplace that I am a rotten woman that I had many affairs that I don't stay with him. My boss said he just told him "We know what kind of a girl she is. Please don't tell us anything about her. This is your personal matter." So now he has stopped following me to the workplace. But otherwise he is always after me.

Since the social role of a 'good woman' does not include being followed around by her husband, DV071 runs the risk of being called a 'bad' woman simply because her husband has decided to stalk her. She not only has to behave within the limitations of the social role of a good woman, she also has to ensure that this behavior is interpreted in the right way regardless of how her husband behaves. Most women are very cognizant that the consequences for not behaving 'properly' are quite severe. Often, women experiencing intimate terrorism found that regardless of the ways in which they acted, there was no relief from the abuse.

I: Did you behave as he wished when he beat you?

DV076 (IT): Yes. I always behaved nicely and yet he used to beat me.

In these cases, women repeatedly used their own performance as a 'good' wife and mother to garner support and validation for themselves. For example, in examining the coping behaviors of women, I found that women experiencing intimate terrorism used the socially prescribed role of a good husband in attempts to shame their husband and family members to end the violence.

DV076 (IT): He burnt my saree and tried to kill me. But I didn't get killed. I went to my mother-in-law immediately and told her that her son had started throwing burning matchsticks at me and my both hands are burnt because of my effort to put off the fire.

Although DV076 experienced horrific levels of abuse, she was able to use the social role of both the 'good' wife as well as the 'good' husband to get her mother-in-law to

intervene on her behalf. Although a lot of women in the study were not able to articulate this duplicity, some women experiencing intimate terrorism understood two things: (1) adhering to any strict social rules or duties did not guarantee that their husbands were not going to assault them, and (2) that the husband himself was not living up to the standards of a good husband. Most women experiencing intimate terrorism were able to articulate the first point, but only a few ($n = 7$) were able to articulate the second. But when they did, they were able to better understand the dynamics of control in the relationship. These women were then able to articulate their needs and desires and set standards for a good marital relationship.

DV024 (IT): If he says he does not want me as a wife, then I won't go. And if he says he wants to stay with me, then he should behave himself. Then he should not beat me, should not harass me. He should behave properly and lead married life happily. Then I don't mind going back. And if he does not agree to that, then he should return whatever belongs to me and be free. He must give maintenance for our daughter.

Women's understanding of the social and marital role of a good husband often guided them in these negotiations. The unambiguous ways in which social and familial duties were constructed within the marriage were often used to defend their stance against their husband with the help of their families, their neighbors, and social institutions such as the police or women's groups. Thus, even while traditional roles of a mother, wife, and a daughter-in-law trap women in violent relationships, and contribute to their control, these very social roles also help women to cope, and to create identities that give them some level of agency.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

One of the most important findings of the study is the documentation of different control tactics that are used in Indian families. While some control tactics such as intimidation, using male privilege, and economic abuse transcend cultural boundaries, others

like the use of children are inflected by the particular cultural context of India. For example, we find that ensuring that women do not have access to monetary resources is a common control tactic that is both found in the U.S. (Pence & Paymar 1993) and in India (ICRW 1998). Using children as a bargaining instrument also translates well across boundaries. In India, however, because of the cultural practice and structure of son preference (Clark 2000), sons and daughters are valued differently and therefore, used differently. Using of sons as a control tactic is quite particular to the Indian context, and is not likely to be transferable to societies where cultural norms of son-preference do not exist.

Another important finding regarding the difference between the two types of violence is the use of alcohol by the violent husband. Husbands who were intimate terrorists were more likely to use violence when they were drunk. For many intimate terrorists, being drunk is used as an excuse to inflict high levels of violence against their wives. In contrast, other alcoholics in the sample did not try to control their wives, as long as they had ready access to alcohol. Violence in these cases was used specifically to fund their addiction.

In addition, the structure of the family is quite influential in the way women experienced situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. Women experiencing intimate terrorism are more likely to have experienced higher controlling contexts from extended family members, and virtually no support from them during the violence. For women experiencing situational couple violence, most of the violence was restricted to the husband, and on many occasions, women were able to solicit help from the marital family to stop the violence.

One of the more unanticipated findings in this research is the importance of social, familial, and marital roles that affect domestic violence in the household. For many women, especially in intimate terrorism, the reasons and justifications for the existence of the

violence hinged on their understanding and expectation of what a 'good' wife should be. While I found evidence that the patriarchal roles of a good wife often trap women in controlling contexts, these very social roles also help women cope with the violence.

Given this complicated relationship between patriarchal structure, domestic violence and coping, we will now examine the different ways in which Indian women cope, the familial and marital contexts that aid and abate coping, as well as the efficacy of these coping strategies in helping women to reduce the violence.

Suicide

She will not think of suicide
It is difficult to devise
ways of dying
and survive the poison
with the guilt of knowing
that the money saved
for the wedding feast
was spent on
extracting the poison
Instead she will take
out the seven saris
saved over long years
in her mother's box
and the locket with
nani's picture that
somehow escaped the
eyes of her drunk father,
put the bundle of her
past in the box
and go to another home
She could well be killed
there for bringing less dowry
The newspaper next day will
carry a small story of yet
another young woman dying
in a stove-burst

Nirupama Dutt

Chapter 6

THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF AGENCY AND COPING STRATEGIES Examining narratives of coping mechanisms

Coping/agency/resistance can be seen as the counterpart to domestic violence because violence and resistance are constantly interacting with each other (Abraham 2002). Many researchers based in the U.S. have documented that women are rarely helpless victims in violent situations. In fact, they have documented high levels of activity in relation to the violence, either in the form of 'active' resistance or 'passive' negotiation with their partners. Coping by women experiencing violence is routinely documented when formal institutions are contacted, and help-seeking behaviors are prominent in many samples of victims of violence. But many women negotiate with their husbands using informal networks such as counseling with their friends, neighbors, etc. before they turn to formal agencies. Thus, we need to examine women's coping not just in terms of their help-seeking with respect to public institutions, but also with respect to private parties.

COPING WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Progression of coping documented in the United States

The process of coping, at least with respect to high control violence (or intimate terrorism), seems to follow a pattern (Duvvury et al. 2004, Pence & Paymar 1993). In the beginning, women are often in denial of the violence, and do not disclose their experience of violence to anyone. Husbands encourage a narrative of 'sporadic' violence, and frequently blame their wives for their 'loss of control'. Initially, women do believe that the violence stems from their own actions. In the second stage, women see that the violence reoccurs without reason or any 'provocation' on their part. They begin to reach out to friends and neighbors for help with their marital problems. They also try to convince their husbands to

stop being violent. Often, women will make their first contact with formal institutions such as the police, social workers, or domestic violence shelters at this stage.

If these measures do not work, and the violence and control has intensified, women will then actively reach out to formal institutions and attempt to leave the relationship. Often, this is the most dangerous stage, because husbands are more likely to put their threats of physical retaliation into action at this time. When women do leave, the last stage is rehabilitating, starting a new life. For women who share custody of children with their violent ex-husbands, this last stage can be characterized by some remnants of controlling tactics, and occasionally the reoccurrence of violence.

Coping in the Indian context

This progression of coping is likely to follow a similar pattern in India, but there are likely to be some deviations. One of the biggest factors that distinguishes coping in India from that in the U.S. is the acceptability of violence within the home. Violence in the Indian household is considered to be acceptable within certain limits (Goel 2005, Jaising 2001, Jaswal 2000, Kishwar 1999). It is only when these lines are crossed that the violence in the household becomes stigmatized, not only by the wife, but also by other members of the family including natal and marital families.

The second difference between the two countries is the dearth of institutional support in India for women who want to leave their relationships. Unlike the U.S., domestic violence shelters are very limited, and only present in the metropolitan regions. If women consider the option of leaving, they must ask themselves – where will they go? Most of the women who do leave return to their natal families, but this presumes that natal families are supportive and are able to financially support their daughter and/or her dependents (INCLLEN Report 1998). Less than 2% of the women who were recently interviewed

regarding their help-seeking behavior approached any institutions such as the police, social workers, or women's groups for help (Report 1998). Women who sought help primarily went to informal networks such as family, friends, neighbors, religious or village leaders (Duvvury et al. 2004). But the 1998 PROWID report indicates that even with these informal sources of networking, women experiencing high-control violence are risking their social and familial prestige by making their 'private' problems public. Thus, even the use of these informal networks is undertaken only after a lot of reflection.

There are some significant gaps in the literature regarding coping. While we do know the rates at which women seek help from public institutions such as the police or women's groups, we still are not aware of: (1) the factors that influence the choice of one coping strategy over another and (2) the efficacy of each strategy in combating or reducing the violence. Also, one of the primary gaps in the literature is that it does not distinguish between the different kinds of violence women experience. Hence, coping behaviors are usually assessed in terms of high control contexts and we do not have any information about women's coping in violent relationships that are not related to patriarchal control.

In addition, coping is often restricted to the discussion of help from informal and formal systems *to leave* the relationship. For example, the success of a coping strategy is often assessed in terms of the number of women who leave the relationship (Duvvury et al. 2004). However, for many women leaving is not a feasible option. Thus, coping must be conceptualized beyond leaving behaviors and must include a wide range of responses that work to reduce or eliminate the violence within the relationship.

CHARACTERISTICS OF COPING IN THE PUNE QUANTITATIVE SURVEYS

TYPES OF COPING

In order to operationalize coping, I used the framework provided by Goodman et al., (2003) as a base to ask questions regarding help-seeking, compliance, avoidance, and resisting behaviors used by women in response to different kinds of violence (see Table 16). These types of coping behaviors include formal networks, legal networks, safety planning, resistance behaviors, and placating behaviors. I will be documenting the use of each of these behaviors by women experiencing violence in my sample.

Formal networks: Out of the approximately one-third of the women who sought help from someone else, only 18% relied on women's groups and approximately 20% went to the police or the courts in response to the violence. This finding is not surprising given the history of underreporting of the violence in India and the stigma that is invariably attached to women and their families when they report. One of the reasons often cited for the underreporting is the lack of awareness about services that are available in the community. This does not apply to the women in my study. All the women I interviewed were within close physical distance of the worker's union and the financial credit union, and were aware of the services provided by these unions. Thus, it seems likely that even when services are available, other factors influence women's use of these services.

Legal networks: Although I interviewed a lot of women who were seeking legal redress against their husbands (13%), most of the legal action was related to divorce, child support, alimony, admittance to the marital home, or child custody. None of the women I interviewed filed a complaint against their husband in response to the violence itself. For

example, none of the women I interviewed had lodged a case under the new Domestic Violence Act.

Table 16: Types of Coping Behaviors (Goodman et al., 2003): US Context

Formal networks	Filing PFA (Protection from Abuse), criminal charges
Legal networks	Talking to family, neighbors and friends to protect children or themselves
Safety planning	Hiding money, saving money, developing code to alert others
Resistance	Fighting physically, shouting back, refusing to comply
Placating	Trying to comply, avoiding, agreeing to demands

Table 17. Descriptive statistics: Types of coping

Coping mechanisms	%
ever tried to leave	9.9
ever rely on someone	23.8
ever ask anyone to stop violence	29.9
police	20.5
counselors/women's groups	17.9
parents/neighbors/friends	60.3
someone intervene	26.2
police	2.6
counselors/women's groups	0.0
parents/neighbors/friends	26.3
comply with everything he says	22.5
try to stay out of the way	11.2
shout back	8.8
fight back	7.5
don't do anything	17.5
try to talk to him	27.5
become silent	36.2
apologize to him	21.2
DV is not important	6.2
filed legal suit	12.9
Total no. of women experiencing violence	39

Informal networks: Out of the one-third women who sought help from other individuals, about 60% relied on a parent, friend, or a neighbor (not shown here). Surprisingly, about 10% of the women experiencing violence relied on marital family members for emotional support when they experienced violence (not shown here).

In addition to help that was sought out from informal networks, women were helped by these networks (such as friends, family members, or neighbors) without being asked (26%, see Table 17). Although one would expect that family members, whether natal (20%) or marital (36%), would be most likely to intervene in a violent relationship, it seems that neighbors (40%) are even more likely to intervene in a violent relationship. This may be because the sample was largely situated in urban slums or rural villages where people live in very close proximity.

Safety planning: None of the women we interviewed engaged in any formal aspect of safety planning. Although a few women admitted to us that they saved some money for the future, they did not see it as a coping strategy against the violence.

Resistance: Some women reported making life a little difficult for their husbands, withholding sex or affection after an episode of violence (3%, not shown here). A slightly higher percentage of women shouted back (8.8%) or fought back (7.5%) in response to the violence (see Table 17).

Placating: About one-fourth of the women comply with everything that a husband says after an incident of violence (23%). A small minority of women also avoided bringing up any problems in response to the violence (3%). About 18% of the women didn't do anything in response to the violence. They neither complied with their husband's wishes, nor did they resist their husband. One of the more prominent placating behaviors that emerged

from the analyses is apologizing. About one-fifth of the women reported that they had apologized to their husbands in response to the violence (21%).

Leaving: About 18% of the women who were beaten wanted to leave their husbands, and about 10% of the women tried to leave their relationship.

Other responses: Not all of the coping strategies women used could be classified under the framework provided by Goodman (1993). A lot of women told us that they would talk to their husbands to end the violence (28%). In fact, this emerged as one of the major coping methods for women. Additionally, women also withdrew physically (12%) and emotionally (6%) after an incident of violence. Women emotionally and physically withdrew from their partners as an automatic reaction to the experience of violence. This should be separated from the resistance technique of withholding sex or affection, in which the women were consciously using the technique to communicate their displeasure to their husbands.

A small minority of women told us that they didn't think that the domestic abuse was important to cope with (6%). Additionally, nearly one-third of the women (36%) became silent as a response to domestic violence. One of the reasons that I didn't classify being silent as part of placating behaviors is because women occasionally used silence as resistance. Women were also silent because they felt they couldn't do anything else. There was a tremendous variability in the way women used silence as a coping mechanism.

COPING AND TYPES OF VIOLENCE

The number of respondents available to investigate the types of coping used in response to different kinds of violence is small. However, it is important to examine the results as indicative of trends and can act as the foundation for our qualitative analyses. In general, we do find differences between the two forms of violence in coping (see Table 18).

In women's immediate responses to violence such as being silent, trying to stay out of his way, complying with his wishes, or apologizing, we find that there are no differences amongst the types of violence. At least half of the women experiencing situational couple violence as well as intimate terrorism appeared to use these coping mechanisms. A higher percentage of women experiencing intimate terrorism say that they wanted to leave the relationship (43%) as opposed to women experiencing situational couple violence (27%).

When we examine help-seeking behavior, we see that while the differences between the two groups are not statistically significant, women experiencing intimate terrorism seem more likely to rely emotionally on someone else as compared to women experiencing situational couple violence (59% in IT compared to 40% in SCV). But other than these 'trends', there are practically no discernable differences between the two groups with regard to asking someone for help, relying on someone for help, or someone intervening of their own volition. As for leaving behaviors, more women experiencing intimate terrorism try to leave the relationship (29%), when compared to women experiencing situational couple violence (13%).

There are small, but statistically insignificant, distinctions between the two groups with regard to resistance behaviors. For example, women experiencing intimate terrorism are more likely to shout or fight back (23% and 27%, respectively) than are women experiencing situational couple violence (7% and 7%, respectively). Being silent in response to violence seems to be used by women experiencing situational couple violence as well as intimate terrorism. Women experiencing intimate terrorism employ talking to their husbands in higher percentages than women experiencing situational couple violence (68% compared to 40%).

Table 18: Coping behaviors by types of violence

	<i>% SCV</i> (<i>n</i> =17)	<i>% IT</i> (<i>n</i> =23)
Ever want to leave? ($\chi^2 = 0.994, df = 1, p = .319$)	26.7	42.9
Ever tried to leave? ($\chi^2 = 1.17, df = 1, p = .278$)	13.3	28.6
Anyone intervene ($\chi^2 = 0.755, df = 1, p = .385$)	60.0	45.5
Every rely on anyone ($\chi^2 = 1.30, df = 1, p = .254$)	40.0	59.1
Ever ask anyone for help ($\chi^2 = 1.713, df = 1, p = .191$)	46.7	68.2
Comply with everything ($\chi^2 = 0.359, df = 1, p = .549$)	40.0	50.0
Shout back ($\chi^2 = 2.45, df = 1, p = .116$)	6.7	27.3
Fight back ($\chi^2 = 1.69, df = 1, p = .193$)	6.7	22.7
Become silent ($\chi^2 = 0.01, df = 1, p = .967$)	73.3	72.7
Apologize ($\chi^2 = 0.55, df = 1, p = .457$)	53.3	40.9
Think DV is not important ($\chi^2 = 3.51, df = 1, p = .061$)	26.7	4.8
Don't do anything ($\chi^2 = 0.21, df = 1, p = .64$)	33.3	40.9
Try to talk to him ($\chi^2 = 2.88, df = 1, p = .09$)	40.0	68.2

Husband's reactions to the violence

We also asked the women the typical reactions of their husband after the violence (see Table 19). About a third of the women experiencing both situational couple violence and intimate terrorism reported that their husband typically felt sorry after an incident of violence. This is not surprising, especially given the well-documented “honeymoon” stages of intimate terrorism, where for a short period of time women are convinced by their husbands that the violence will never repeat again.

As for situational couple violence, it is possible that men who commit these violent acts without the controlling context are, in fact, feeling remorse at the use of violence. Women experiencing situational couple violence were more likely to report that their

husband apologized to them after the violence (60%), compared to women experiencing intimate terrorism (41%). Additionally, only about 23% of intimate terrorists tell their wives that the violence will never repeat, as opposed to 40% of women experiencing situational couple violence.

Table 19: Husband's response to violence by type of violence

Husband's response	% SCV (n=17)	% IT (n=23)
Feels sorry ($\chi^2 = 0.544$, df = 1, p=.461)	33.3	45.5
Apologizes ($\chi^2 = 1.30$, df = 1, p=.254)	60.0	40.9
Says he will never repeat DV ($\chi^2 = 1.27$, df = 1, p=.259)	40.0	22.7
Gives gifts ($\chi^2 = 2.02$, df = 1, p=.154)	26.7	9.1
Acts as if nothing happened ($\chi^2 = 0.02$, df = 1, p=.89)	46.7	36.4
Blames you ($\chi^2 = 0.21$, df = 1, p=.641)	59.1	40.9
Gives you reasons ($\chi^2 = 0.21$, df = 1, p=.641)	20.0	18.2

We find small differences among husbands' reactions to violence when we examine giving of gifts after an incident of violence. Very few intimate terrorists give gifts to their wives after an incident of violence (9%), compared to women experiencing situational couple violence (27%). Intimate terrorists do not seem to make much of an effort to 'win' women back. Intimate terrorists are less likely to blame their wives or act as if nothing happened after an incident of violence. This is very surprising given intimate terrorists have a greater stake in ensuring that their wives are blamed for the violence. One of the possible explanations could be that the control contexts in the relationship are so normative that men do not have to blame her. These dynamics can be better assessed through a close examination of the narratives of coping in response to different kinds of domestic violence.

CHARACTERISTICS OF COPING IN THE PUNE NARRATIVES

While Goodman et al. (2003) and others give us a good framework, I found that most of the coping strategies that women used in India fell outside the framework. Therefore, a full listing of all the coping mechanisms that women typically used would be a useful place to start before examining the ways in which they were used. In addition, I categorized each of the tactics into groups that I found to be useful (see Table 20).

Table 20: Types of Coping Behaviors – Indian context

Types	Examples
Help-seeking behaviors	Asking for help, attempting suicide
Conciliatory behaviors	Being silent, apologizing, tolerating, minimizing, compliance
Negotiating behaviors	Talking to husband, reasoning, negotiating
Independent behaviors	Ignoring, asserting, subverting/hiding
Resistance behaviors	Physically attacking, complaining, confronting,
Leaving behaviors	Leaving, wanting to leave

Help-seeking behaviors

Asking for help: Despite the physical and familial restrictions, many women found ways to contact their family members, relatives, and neighbors for help. This was most commonly seen with women experiencing intimate terrorism.

I: Did you tell your mom?

DV021 (IT): My husband did not allow me to call her. Then sometimes, when my father came to visit me, I used to tell him ‘I don’t want to stay here. He beats me everyday’.

Many family members, relatives, and neighbors intervened of their own volition to help the women. This was particularly prominent for women living in the urban slums. In the urban areas, neighbors often intervened in the violence, especially if the violence was carried out in a public space. Although there is some evidence that women use formal networks such as women's groups and the police if they are accessible, seeking help from the police in the rural areas was a rarity and seen as a last resort. Women from Pimpri (the urban slum) were most likely to have gone to the police for help, because of the easy accessibility of the police station.

I: When your husband used to beat you, did you tell any one?

DV009 (IT): I complained to police. He was not listening to anyone else.

Thinking about or attempting suicide: Although only five women told us that they had attempted suicide, many women told us that they often thought about or felt like ending their lives. They told us that they were either restricted by the presence of other family members, or they thought it would shame their families if they took their own lives.

I: What did you do exactly when you tried to commit suicide?

DV036 (IT): I tried to eat medicine and die. But he didn't let me eat it.

I: That means he knew that you are going to eat medicine?

DV036 (IT): Yes, he saw me taking it out.

The five women who did attempt suicide told us that they attempted to die after informing one of their family members. In one case, a woman locked herself in a room after telling her son that she was going to hang herself. Her son informed her husband, and she was rescued. By taking this extreme step, women hoped to bring attention to their situation and illustrate

the seriousness of the matter. It is therefore not surprising to note that all the women who tried to commit suicide were experiencing intimate terrorism.

Conciliatory behaviors

Being silent: Being silent was also one of the most common responses from women, especially immediately after an incident of violence.

I: What do you do when such restrictions are put?

DV005 (IT): What can you do when such restrictions are put...Just keep quiet, if he says, 'Don't go', then its better to avoid.

One of the primary reasons for being silent was that women were often not allowed to speak during or after an incident of violence, especially in intimate terrorist relationships. In fact, speaking or trying to communicate with their husbands during or after the incident of violence increased the chances of being beaten again. Being silent was often the best immediate response. But for many women experiencing intimate terrorism, and for some women in situational couple violence, this was not always the case.

DV012 (SCV): Even if I keep quiet, he doesn't stop talking. If he keeps scolding me even when I haven't done anything wrong, I am not able to take it then. In the beginning, I was new and used to keep quiet as I used to be scared of him. About 3-4 years went by in this manner. But he doesn't change even when I keep quiet.

In addition, being silent was often aggravating to the husband, especially when he was drunk.

One woman experiencing intimate terrorism told us that being silent during an argument was often considered a 'provocation' for violence, so she had to walk a thin line between being silent and 'talking back'.

Apologizing: Many women reported that they apologized to their husbands after an incident of violence. Women experiencing intimate terrorism tended to apologize either to defuse the tension in the marital relationship, or if they felt that it was their fault.

DV005 (IT): Sister-in-law used to say that I didn't do work. Then he used to get angry and vent his anger on me. I used to say that I was sorry to decrease tension.

In addition, it was easier to apologize when women were given specific reasons that justified the violence. For example, one of the women reported being beaten by her husband because she had neglected her child's needs (DV032). She felt that the violence was justified because she felt responsible for the child, and she apologized to her husband after the violence.

Tolerating: Women experiencing intimate terrorism usually tolerated the violence if they were hopeful that the violence would end on its own ($n = 11$), but sometimes this hope was short-lived.

I: When you were staying with your husband, then did you feel that beatings would stop one day?

DV005 (IT): Oh! Yes! I did feel that sometime or the other, there would be peaceful atmosphere; my husband would talk to me nicely. I keep on tolerating things because I felt so. But later, this went on increasing.

Tolerating was also a strategy that worked for women experiencing situational couple violence, although it was not used by many women ($n = 4$).

DV012 (SCV): Even if I have such thought, I told myself that I have a son who would get good education in the city and not here in the village. So, I stay there. Many a times, I have compromised here in the organization and gone back there.

In addition, for some women experiencing alcohol-induced violence (in the context of both intimate terrorism and situational couple violence), if they were unable to get help for the alcoholism, they tolerated or reconciled themselves to the violence.

Minimizing: Many women experiencing situational couple violence dismissed the violence as not being very important as a way of coping with it. In general, women dismissed the violence by blaming it on petty arguments that were bound to

happen in a marital relationship. Women experiencing intimate terrorism also minimized the violence to cope with it, albeit for different reasons. Most of the women who did minimize the violence were ashamed of the violence they were experiencing and had not told anyone about the violence before.

I: Why don't you feel like telling others that your husband beats you?

DV075 (IT): Husband and wife are bound to have fights I don't feel like telling everyone [about private affairs].

While women experiencing intimate terrorism minimize the impact of violence to be able to live with it, women experiencing situational couple violence did not pay attention to the violence because they didn't think it was a very important part of the relationship.

Compliance: Most women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence used a wide range of compliance behaviors. This includes listening to their husband's requests, rectifying 'mistakes', promising never to make the same mistake twice, and being vigilant about everything that a husband might feel displeased by. One can easily imagine that the last two compliant behaviors are more likely to be used by women experiencing intimate terrorism than situational couple violence.

DV024 (IT): Because there is no other reason [to beat me]. I don't do anything against his wishes. I behave the way he wants me to. I look after the household and cooking – everything. What mistake can I make for which he would beat me then?

In addition, women (experiencing situational couple and intimate terrorism) often complied when they knew there would be verbal or violent retaliations for non-compliance.

DV012 (SCV): I have to do [everything he says]. Otherwise, he would trouble me more, or beat me more. So I feel it is better to do it.

Thus, compliance behaviors are not exclusively a characteristic of coping with intimate terrorism, although more women experiencing intimate terrorism use compliance to diminish the impact of the high-control violence.

Negotiating behaviors

Talking to husband: Almost all the women in the sample told us that their first response to violence was to talk to their husbands about ending it.

DV026 (IT): I spoke a number of times but it didn't make any difference. We stayed in a different home to avoid staying in the same house (with the in-laws). But still, it didn't work.

The result of talking to the husband varied for women experiencing situational couple and intimate terrorism. Women experiencing situational couple violence often felt that their husbands listened to them, even if they didn't always implement what their wives suggested. But for women experiencing intimate terrorism, the talking invariably fell on deaf ears.

DV067 (IT): I tell him not to do it. I sit and cry. I try my best to tell him nicely. I talk to him in the morning when he gets up. I tell him that it is neither good nor appropriate to do so. He says "yes, yes" but when he drinks, we are back to square one.

It is usually when women perceive that husbands are not listening to them, that they start approaching other family members for help.

Reasoning: Reasoning with the husband primarily involves talking to the husband to try to make sense of the violence that they are experiencing. For women experiencing situational couple violence, this was usually tied to the reasons that they were experiencing domestic violence, and the articulation of specific behavior modifications that they would have to do in order to avoid being assaulted again. For women experiencing intimate terrorism, this process was a highly complicated project.

DV026 (IT): Now sometimes he made mistakes and sometimes I did. But how can it be right if he beats even when it is his mistake? If I make a mistake, it is alright.

When women experiencing intimate terrorism were confronted with the fact that the violence persisted regardless of their behavior, they often tried to produce evidence that would help them to understand the reasons behind the violence.

DV005 (IT): It is difficult. If I am not allowed to go here or there, then who am I supposed to talk to? What am I supposed to do? I say, 'If I go wrong anywhere, you have every right to stop me'. But when I am really doing everything proper, then why should he do this to me?

As they try to understand their experience, women experiencing intimate terrorism begin to understand that the violence is often independent of the reasons stated for the violence.

Negotiating: Women also explicitly negotiated with the husband to reduce the violence. This often combined compliance and reasoning behaviors with one important element: the compliance was conditional. For example, some women experiencing intimate terrorism agreed to do what their husbands requested of them, but only if certain conditions were met. These conditions usually involved a change in the husband's behavior.

DV024 (IT): I have only one thing to say that he should be more understanding and lead a good married life. If he does not want to lead a married life, then he should pay alimony for my daughter, return my jewelry, pay for my maintenance and he can do whatever he wants to do separately.

The women used this as a coping strategy only when they had some resources to negotiate with. For example, in the case illustrated above, DV024 had filed a case against her husband for alimony, and she had agreed to withdraw her case if her demands were met. Only a few women experiencing situational couple violence ($n = 4$) used negotiating behaviors to cope with violence.

Independent behaviors

Ignoring: Women experiencing situational couple violence often ignored the violence because they did not see it as important in their marital lives. For women experiencing

intimate terrorism, ignoring as a coping strategy was used to ignore the husband's actions other than the violence.

DV004 (IT): He would buy clothes for the children whenever he felt like it or else I had to manage on my own in Rs. 300 or Rs. 400 only. Then later, I stopped asking for that too. I said, I didn't need anything from him.

Women experiencing intimate terrorism and some women experiencing alcohol-induced situational couple violence used these tactics. In both cases, women ignored men's negligent behaviors as a way of coping with them.

Being assertive: Being assertive is a very broad category that includes a variety of behaviors, from single acts of independence (e.g., defying a specific order from their husband) to a series of actions that establish her independence (e.g. establishing a separate household or earning a separate livelihood). Most assertive acts by women experiencing intimate terrorism involved leaving the household permanently or for a brief period of time.

DV009 (IT): He knows nothing about love. If he was treating me well, gave me money, I would have loved him too. But he gave nothing. So why should I insist on having a relationship with him?

But for most women in situational couple violence and some women experiencing intimate terrorism, it involved trying to be assertive within the structure of the household. As illustrated in the example before, many of the women using this strategy refused to engage in any conciliatory or negotiatory behaviors

Subverting/hiding: Some women deceived their husbands, appearing to be conciliatory while resisting his demands. In order to do this, women hid these reactive actions from their husbands, or tried to convince them of the rationality of their own actions. They were used both by women experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism.

I: Should she resist when he beats?

DV080 (SCV): No No. She should sweet talk him into telling her. Ask him sweetly why he behaves that way. She should find out what's on his mind.

While only four women used subverting as a coping strategy, most of the women using these techniques used hiding predominantly.

I: Does your husband know how much you earn?

DV080 (SCV): No. No. Then he doesn't give me any. If I tell him that I get 5000 then he won't go to work at all. He will just sit at home. Then he will say that that if my wife is earning well then why should I go to work?

Resistance behaviors

Physically attacking: A lot of the women scoffed at the idea of using physical force to cope with violence.

DV005 (IT): No. Can anyone think of beating a husband? He is supposed to be a god.

Despite this assertion, we found that many of the women experiencing intimate terrorism had resisted their husband's violence with violence. However, this physical retaliation took place only when women felt safe in their surroundings. For example, most of the women who hit their husbands did so when their husbands were inebriated and were not conscious. In addition, women often got their family members or the police to hit their husbands for them.

Other voice: Sometimes both start beating each other.

DV007 (SCV): My sons cannot tolerate my husband's beating. So the sons do counterattack on him.

Because women took advantage of their husband's weakened state to use violence, most of the retaliation tended to go unnoticed, and therefore, was not very effective in reducing the violence. Even in the three cases where the women had gotten the police to beat up the husband, they complained that his behavior remained unchanged.

Complaining: Women often complained to formal and informal networks about the violence. This is distinct from help-seeking. Women use help-seeking to find ways to reduce the violence, but in the case of complaining, women simply want validation from social networks that the violence is not justified.

DV080 (SCV): One day I told his sister “She should take her brother and keep him with her. I won’t tolerate all this. How long can I go on like this? I am tired now. I don’t have any support from him. I have to pay the house rent and this and that. How long can I run the household alone?”

In addition, these complaints are often aired with either the implicit or explicit purpose of shaming or humiliating their husbands. Although there were a few women experiencing alcohol-induced situational couple violence who used complaining as a strategy, it was mostly used by women experiencing intimate terrorism.

Confronting: Women experiencing situational couple violence often confronted their husbands or the marital families about the violence. This differed from reasoning or negotiating; they refused to take blame for the violence and they wanted to present an alternative version to their husband’s story.

DV012 (SCV): No. I just cannot keep quiet when he keeps talking in that manner. If someone verbally abuses you, you are not able to tolerate it. Then you say something. Then he says something and thus, the argument gets more and more heated. Then that is enough for him to fight and beat.

Some women experiencing intimate terrorism also used confrontational techniques, and as in the case of some women experiencing situational couple violence, there were violent recriminations. In this manner, women in the study used these confrontational techniques very strategically.

Leaving behaviors

Leaving: Many women experiencing both forms of violence left their husbands for their natal families after an episode of violence. Most of them didn't leave the marital household permanently, but as a sign of protest against their husband's behavior. This behavior was also prevalent among women whose husbands were not violent.

I: Have you ever left home because of a fight?

DV017 (NV): We had a really bad fight. Then I had said that I didn't want to stay there and had walked up to the road's end. But he brought me back home. That's all. Otherwise, never again.

Usually, women left to live in their natal homes until their husband came to pick them up. In one instance (DV004), a husband suggested that his wife leave the marital home till her anger (for the violence) subsided. He told her that he would pick her up when she was ready to forgive him. Although the pattern of leaving as a sign of protest was fairly common for both situational couple violence and intimate terrorism, women experiencing intimate terrorism were more likely to leave their marital homes permanently.

DV076 (IT): [I left home] because he said that he wouldn't take care. I would have stayed even if he had continued to beat. But he refused to take care of my children and me.

Leaving however, did not always end the violence. For many women with controlling husbands, the violence continued even when they moved to their natal homes.

I: Now you have left your in-laws' home and have returned to your parents' home. Does he still beat you?

DV024 (IT): Yes. He still beats me.

Women were often followed when they left their homes for errands or work, and a few episodes of violence happened for four women in the study on the road when they were traveling. Husbands who were controlling were also not shy of beating in front of her natal family members. In fact, five women told us that their husbands came to their natal homes

and beat them up, despite the protests of her natal family. This usually happened when there were no male members in her natal family to physically restrain the husband. In the case illustrated above, the natal family of DV024 consisted of only her elderly mother.

Wanting to leave: Wanting to leave the relationship was a common response of women experiencing intimate terrorism. They didn't leave primarily because of several restrictions, prominent among them the social stigma attached to the dissolution of the marriage.

I: When you felt that this marriage is not going to last, did you then feel like leaving him?

DV030: I felt like ending my life. Why should I leave? People gossip about you when you leave.

This fear of social disapproval stopped many women from leaving their homes permanently. In addition, many women didn't have familial resources such as the support of their natal family, or the financial resources that are required to leave their marital home.

CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES ON COPING

The problem with classifying these coping strategies into categories is that it obfuscates the circumstances under which women use them, and the factors that become primary in deciding which strategy is likely to reduce or eliminate violence from their lives. In order to get a more holistic picture about the manner in which these coping strategies are used, I will examine the structural, familial, and marital context of coping as well as the restrictions women have when using various coping techniques.

STRUCTURAL CONTEXT

Urban and rural environment

One of the primary ways in which urban and rural environments affect coping is through the social stigma associated with making private problems (like violence) public. For example, leaving the marital home is not likely to be a feasible option for women in rural

areas because of the dishonor associated with leaving a marital relationship. Because of the fairly closed social networks in rural environments, women were less likely to be able to keep the 'shame' of leaving their marital household private.

DV036 (IT): No, I didn't feel like [leaving]. I thought my mother was all alone. If I got divorced, then her neighbours would talk about it, or trouble her. They don't do so in a city. But in villages they talk (condemn) a lot. Even when a woman stays at her parents' house for 8 days, then they talk. I thought if I married someone else, then my people who stay in the village, would lose the respect they have.

Additionally, as DV036 puts it, many women tolerate the violence in order to protect not only their living situations, but also those of their families. Urban environments were not necessarily always freer for women. While social life in the rural areas is most likely to be highly monitored, it is the absence of this very feature that makes it problematic for women to approach informal or formal networks in urban settings.

DV070 (IT): No. He does not ever send me out alone, because the people from the surrounding community are not good. So, he does not ever send me out alone.

While social control works in both environments, the social control in the urban environment curtails women's movements by inducing a fear of the 'other' or the 'outsider'. In fact, compared to the rural contexts, I found that many women experiencing intimate terrorism in the urban areas were more isolated. In the rural areas, these women were typically allowed to walk to work, or to buy vegetables since they were likely to know everyone in the village and their behaviors could be closely monitored or socially controlled through community networks. This was not the case for many urban women experiencing intimate terrorism.

I: You didn't go out or he didn't permit you?

DV076 (IT): He didn't allow. Always cooped up at home. I didn't even know where the vegetable market was.

In addition, unattached women (whether divorced or separated from their husbands) in the urban areas were more likely to be prey to unwanted attention from other men in the locality. While women in the rural areas were also likely to get harassed, they had social networks in their village that often acted as a safety net. Still, for both urban and rural women experiencing intimate terrorism, the choices were either to move back with their natal families in the community or remain in the marital household.

Another factor interacting with the urban-rural environments was the family structure. Many of the women living in the urban areas lived in nuclear families, away from the marital family household, which typically was situated in a rural area. Although there were many urban joint family households, most of the nuclear families in the cities had rural ties. Sometimes this transition from the rural to the urban environments was made to escape the controlling context of the rural marital household.

DV073 (SCV): Then at that time they started saying that they would get their son married again.. and things like that...My husband used to listen to his mother at that time. He was educated and used to stay in Pune. I used to stay in the village. But he didn't have any freedom and so even I didn't have any freedom. I said that I didn't want to stay in a joint family. I asked what is going to happen if we continue to stay in jointly? Today though I am educated, I am doing only house work. I cannot do anything else. Saying so, I got out of that place and came here [to Pune city with my husband].

As this story indicates, the move from the rural environment to the urban one helped DV073 not only to escape the control context, but the violence as well. She reported that while her husband had slapped her a few times in his rural household, he was no longer violent towards her in the nuclear household. However, the ties to the rural context and to the marital family are not broken without consequences. In this case, DV073's relationship with her marital home became permanently estranged, and she told us that she never went to visit her marital household.

Formal networks (police and women's groups)

About one-third of the women had approached the police or women's groups for help. Part of the sample that I collected was contacted because they had used the services of the three organizations I was working with. It is not surprising that women accessed these formal networks for help. What is surprising is that there were still women in my sample who told us that they didn't know about the services provided by the organizations. Such a finding is interesting given that I contacted all the women in my sample through the social networks of the organizations.

I: Why didn't you feel like taking help? Or you were not aware that such help is available?

DV005 (IT): I didn't know and was not aware either. I didn't have those kinds of thoughts. It is recently that I have started thinking in that direction.

This becomes especially problematic when the women are dealing with intimate terrorism, given the severity and frequency of violence and control, and the heightened need for help.

If one of the primary restrictions in accessing formal networks is ignorance of these networks, another is the social stigma attached to accessing these networks. Many of the women reported to us that the primary reason they didn't ask for help from the organizations even when they knew about it is because they didn't think anyone outside their household could help them to stop the violence. In addition, they were scared of airing their private problems to strangers. This was mostly true for women experiencing situational couple violence who had never told anyone (other than us) about the violence.

For women experiencing intimate terrorism, there seems to be a threshold of violence and control that they could tolerate, after which they approached the police or other formal networks.

I: Did you ever try to leave him?

DV009 (IT): I tried hundred times. But he never allowed me to go. Once I beat him and then I filed police complaint. So police also beat him.

When women did approach these social agencies, the utility of these services seems to be two-pronged. Going to the police and the women's organization influenced the characteristics of the violence directly.

DV003 (IT): Yes. I was staying with my parents in a village. Yet he used to come at night and beat me. People at home used to protect me. But who can bother for five whole years? Now that I have the support of an organization, the beating has stopped. Once in a while, he used to do that. But for the past 3 years, it has not happened at all.

Many women, especially women experiencing situational couple violence, reported that mediation sessions that the organizations instituted in response to domestic violence helped them not only to return to their marital home (if they were abandoned), but also helped stop the violence.

For many women, this help-seeking was also indirectly influential in many positive ways. Apart from getting external help to confront the husband, they also report feeling validated by the organizations.

DV005 (IT): There was no opportunity to talk to anyone, no permission to visit anyone – not even nearby – I was not smart, that's why. And now after coming out, I started listening to others. So, now I am able to talk to you. I used to shiver even at the thought of talking to someone.

Thus, the organizations were able to build a support system for the woman to regain a sense of self and identity.

In my personal communication with the heads of the three organizations I was working with, at least one of them (Maval micro-credit union, Somatne sample), was heavily invested in marital communication and mediation. They trained their caseworkers to teach couples to state their demands clearly, so that misunderstandings could be cleared up. This

stress on restoring marital communication is evidently not uncommon on the part of women's groups. The Report on Best Practices undertaken by the Tata Institute of Social Sciences in Mumbai found that most of the police and legal responses were concentrated on mediation (Duvvury et al. 2004, Elizabeth 2000). The tendency of most organizations to use this approach is two-fold: first, women themselves do not want a dissolution of the marriage, and second, the organizations were heavily influenced by the view that the institution of marriage is sacrosanct and all measures must be undertaken to preserve it.⁴

While organizations seem to help women by validating their needs and providing a structure that is supportive of women's needs, I also found that women who came to the organization felt that the organization could do very little except sent letters to the husband who never bothered to show up for any of the mediation sessions.

DV036 (IT)'s Mother: We sent 4 letters to them. One was the registered letter. But still those people haven't come. Then what am I supposed to do?

I: What does the organization say?

DV036 (IT)'s Mother: Nothing, today one more letter is sent.

This is one of the primary problems with mediation: it assumes the willingness of both parties to have a conversation. In intimate terrorist relationships, the husband has no stake in having his behavior towards his wife dictated by the organization. In this context, non-

⁴ In my own experience, I found that mediation was not devoid of its own problems. For example, in MMVS in Somante, I witnessed a mediation session with a couple. They were accompanied by their respective families. During the mediations, while the mediators tried to open some lines of communication, the husband and the wife appeared to be uncooperative. In this particular instance, I found that class played an important part in the implementation of these mediations. For example, the head of the organization, a high-caste Brahmin, became increasingly frustrated that the husband, a lower-caste farmer, was not listening to her suggestions. From my own observations, I felt that while the husband was definitely deferential, he was not necessarily conceding, and the only reason he wasn't very open about his dissent was because of the power relationship driven by class and caste consciousness. Since this was an isolated incident, I can only speculate whether the mediation that is carried out by people of power outside the home can be effectively implemented in the power dynamics in the household.

participation in these sessions becomes another way in which husbands control their wife's behavior.

However, caseworkers told me that these letters served a function. The letters are often considered to be the first step. If there was no response to the letters, the caseworkers started preparing petitions to the courts. The letters were often a formality so that both parties could have a chance at reconciliation. In addition, the letters became proof for action in the court system to ensure that efforts had been taken to mediate or to negotiate with no avail.

Women usually used the organization to file these petitions. The petitions were mostly concerned with wanting to be returned to the marital home, demanding alimony and/or shared custody of children. The women who were filing these suits were more likely to have experienced intimate terrorism. For the majority of the women who filed suits, the severity and the frequency of violence increased, even when they were living separately from their husbands. In addition, they were often maligned in public for their 'loose' character once they filed their suits.

DV008 (IT): He was good in the beginning. But when I filed the suit, then he started suspecting me. I have asked for alimony. He says anything in front of the judge – 'She is not my wife, she has an affair'. Now, he says all these things. He didn't say that in the beginning. When I filed a complaint, then he started saying that I have an affair with someone else.

In four cases, women were followed to their workplace, and the husbands told their employers about personal details of the wives. In other cases, harassment in the form of threats to life, stalking, and verbal abuse became routine. While women were troubled by these control tactics, many of them were quite insistent that they needed to pursue the legal route, for two reasons: (1) they didn't think the harassment would stop once they dropped the lawsuit, and (2) they didn't have any other alternatives.

Many women experiencing intimate terrorism were dissuaded from taking help of formal agencies either due to the costs of filing legal action against their husbands or because they didn't think this help was viable or useful.

I: You have been staying here since your wedding?

DV021 (IT): Yes. My husband comes here for 4-5 months, stays here and then runs away – again. Two or three times we took him to Women's centre, but that was of no use.

Many women who had left their husbands didn't even bother filing suits or taking any legal action to get a formal divorce, because they dismissed it as a waste of time. Compounding this problem is that the help that women got from the police and the women's networks was uncoordinated and inconsistent.

DV024 (IT): I could not tolerate it anymore. Then I went to the police station and complained. They said that I have already lodged a complaint in the women's organization, and so they cannot do anything about it.

In this case, application to the women's agency seems to have disqualified her from any help from the police. While there are no legal restrictions for women to appeal through women's groups *and* through the police, the paternalistic and patriarchal attitudes that pervade the legal and the judicial system tend to dissuade women from exploring these options. Hence, even when women consider these options, they don't seem useful to them.

I: Did you ever feel that you should consult someone about this?

DV026 (IT): I had gone to the police station too, to take advice. But they didn't offer me any advice. Once I came here [to the organization], but I have not got proper advice yet from anywhere.

Given all of these factors, it is not surprising that women rarely report domestic violence to legal authorities, unless they are in dire straits, and even then help is not always assured.

While women's groups aid women in mediating with their husbands, I suspect that these mediations are more likely to be useful in cases of situational couple violence than in

intimate terrorism. In the latter case, it is likely that the husband is unwilling to relinquish his control to his wife. Moreover, there is very little that organizations can do to prevent men from exerting control over their wives in the privacy of their homes. Understandably, women are more likely to find help from their families and friends.

Informal social networks: Friends and neighbors

Women were more likely to use friends and neighbors in urban slums or in housing arrangements where houses were situated in close proximity. Neighbors or friends only came to help women when they knew the women and understood the nature of the violence. For example, I found that many women who had alcoholic husbands (irrespective of control context) were more likely to be helped by neighbors, because the neighbors were most aware of the husband's habits. Additionally, asking for help in some cases was unnecessary. Neighbors and friends were able to intervene to stop the violence of their own volition if they became aware of the violence.

AshaTai: When your husband beats you, did you tell your parents or friends or neighbours?

DV007 (SCV): Yes. I tell our neighbours. Then they come to intervene.

This help was useful in both the short and long term. In the short term, women were able to call for help to immediately stop a particular act of violence. In the long term, the social pressure from the neighbors to stop the violence could alleviate the incidence of violence.

Women reported that neighbors tried to convince their husband to stop beating her, often basing their arguments on the women being good wives and mothers. From conversations with caseworkers, I found that neighbors were more likely to intervene if they felt that there was no justification for the violence, and/or the violence was alcohol-induced. However, for many women, this source of help was not always useful.

I: Did somebody come to help you when you were being battered?

DV021 (IT): Yes. But my husband used to curse that person. Then nobody intervened.

This was most likely with women experiencing intimate terrorism. They complained that even when neighbors intervened, it didn't have any impact on their husbands. If the violence persisted and escalated over time, the neighbors often turned a blind eye to the violence, because they were quite helpless to stop it, either in the short term or in the long term.

I: Did you ever share with your neighbours?

DV009 (IT): With whom can I share? Once or twice, it is okay. They advised me to stay at home and live family life. Who wants to meddle in others' problems? Earlier they used to come and resolve. But when it became a regular affair, nobody bothers to come.

It seems then that there is a threshold after which help from neighbors and friends ceases to be useful. While neighbors and friends may not be able to help with reducing the violence, they do help by providing emotional and occasionally financial help to women experiencing intimate terrorism. In the following case, while the woman did not find relief from the violence with the help of the neighbors, she was amply helped by her neighbors in securing some independent means of livelihood and income so that she was not completely dependent on her husband.

DV066: There I used to work for one lady. When [my in-laws] went out, I used to quickly do her work and come back. She secretly used to bring sari petticoats or blouses for me. Or sometimes, utensils. I collected these things for my household. Then one baker gave me some Jute bags. I built my hut with the help of bags.

The support of these informal networks helps women to deal with the controlling contexts, if not the violence itself.

FAMILY CONTEXT

Family structure

Examining family structure is critical to our understanding of women's coping skills and strategies. Similar to the influence of family structure on controlling contexts, the diverse family forms come with unique features that both help and hinder women's efforts to cope with the violence. If women are dealing with intimate terrorism, being situated in a joint family system does not help, especially if the marital family is part of the controlling context. Also, because such women are living with other individuals in the same household, there is very little they can do to get help from outside the household, especially if other members of the household are heavily supervising them.

DV003 (IT): Right in the beginning, it was made clear that I could not see anyone. So, the question [of going out for help] did not arise. All this could be done only when I visited my parents, and not here. They always tried to find out who was with me. They had this suspicious attitude.

For many women like DV003, the only relief that they could find from the confines of a controlling joint family system was the occasional visit from or to the natal family. Visits to natal families gave women more freedom and space away from their marital homes to talk to their family members and strategize about coping. However, for many women ($n = 10$), these visits were completely forbidden.

I: If you wanted to visit your parents?

DV021 (IT): They didn't send me. 'Once a girl is married, there is no question of going back to parents' – that was my mother-in-law's opinion.

In these situations, women made use of the limited time they had with their natal family members who came to visit them in their marital home. Even though these visits were most likely to be supervised, women slipped notes to their family members, and used small

windows of opportunity to convey messages. These coping techniques did have consequences. In one case, when a woman was caught slipping something to her brother who had come to see her, she was severely beaten after her brother left. Women had to be very careful when accessing these forms of help.

Family structure was also influential when women separated from the home and filed lawsuits against the family. For example, in the case described below, about a third of the violence that the woman experienced after her separation from her husband came from her husband's brother.

DV008 (IT): I have filed a suit asking to be taken back home as his wife. When I went to his place, his brother had beaten me up. Then, I came back here to my mother. When I went to his home, there was a fight and my brother-in-law beat me.

Although in the United States women are likely to suffer severe levels of violence when they leave the relationship, this danger is taken to new heights in the Indian context. This is primarily because when women experiencing intimate terrorism leave their husbands, they are breaking ties with their husband *and* the entire marital family. So, the honor of the marital family, and sometimes the natal family, is often at stake. This is true especially if the woman has decided to take legal recourse against the husband, and by extension, the entire family.

Given that marriages in India are often based on relationships between families, and not necessarily between the spouses, leaving the relationship often means that women have to consider the consequences not only for themselves, but also for their natal families. As indicated earlier, women are often worried that their leaving might have an effect on the reputation and honor of their natal families and tend to stay in their violent relationship to avoid any disgrace. Additionally, women are influenced by the attitudes prevalent in the natal family when they are coping with the violence.

I: Did you feel within 1 or 2 years of your marriage that this marriage is not going to last, there may be problems?

DV021: I used to talk to my mother and say ‘I don’t know whether he would be a good husband’. But my mother used to say ‘husbands are like that. He will improve’. But I never felt that our marriage would not last.

The persistence of the women in maintaining the relationship is heavily influenced by these expectations of a good husband, which are often reinforced by the marital household. However, not all natal families encouraged women to tolerate the violence, and were sometimes accepting of women’s resolve to leave the relationship.

I: Then how did it stop?

DV063: It didn’t stop. Then at last my father came and brought me home.

In one example, both the marital and natal families wanted DV012 to leave her alcoholic gambling husband. Both families thought it would be best for DV012 to divorce her husband, re-marry and take good care of her son. However, despite the efforts of her parents-in-law, her parents, and the organization, she was adamant about staying with her husband.

This example illustrates a key finding when examining the impact of family structure on coping: one of the most prominent sources of help for the woman experiencing situational couple violence, and occasionally intimate terrorism, is the marital family. In fact, one of the prominent coping strategies that most women, regardless of the controlling context, use is to talk to their marital family about ending the violence. In many instances, extended family members were able to stop particular instances of violence. This was true especially when women were experiencing violence (regardless of controlling context) that was not supported by the extended marital family.

DV074 (SCV): Then I tell his brother to bring him inside and explain things to him. Then his brother gets mad at him and asks him why he behaves in this manner. Then [my husband] starts swearing at me, creates a scene and asks why I informed his brother.

In this particular case, the internal dynamics of the family household helped the woman immensely. The husband, by DV074's admission, was the black sheep of the family. He was a drug addict, alcoholic, and unemployed. He often stole from the family and was generally a disruptive force in the family. Therefore, when he was violent towards DV074, the entire family was supportive of her, and the elder brother was able to use his power and authority as the head of the household to restrict the violence to a large degree. But even these forms of intervention are often seen as interference, and women are not always free of violence, even if they have the support of their marital homes.

DV070 (IT): Yes. I did [tell my mother-in-law]. But my husband neglected her totally. He does not fear anyone in the house. His elder brother or his mother. He is not afraid of them.

This is true especially in the case of intimate terrorism. In these cases, where the husband is highly controlling of the wife and the larger family structure is not supportive, the violence is only reduced, but not eliminated. In the following example, even though there was strong social and familial disapproval of the husband's violence, he continued to beat her.

I: But didn't your brother-in-law support you?

DV006 (IT): Never. My husband didn't allow anyone to speak at all.

There was some diversity with regard to the support given by marital households. Women themselves are ambivalent about the help that their marital households gave them, as were the marital family members themselves. This ambivalence is most likely to be seen among women experiencing situational couple violence.

DV004 (SCV): Yes, they did come. They cursed quite a lot. They said, 'Let it be! If she doesn't talk, let her be!' When he beat me up, that is what they said. But I think they did feel good about my

husband beating me. If I didn't talk to them, then I deserved it. Then when I got back from the clinic, my mother-in-law saw that I had fever, gave me medicine, gave me dinner.

It is likely that this ambivalence for this family comes from having to choose between the son and the daughter-in-law.

These interpersonal dynamics make it difficult to say anything general about the impact of family structure on coping. On one hand, women have witnesses to the violence, and have some forms of emotional and financial support, however reluctant they may be. However, these additional members can just as easily be spectators and monitors of her behavior, making it difficult to cope with the violence in an active manner. Thus, coping with violence in the context of family is not tied in a simple way to family structure, and is heavily influenced by particular family factors.

Family support (natal or marital)

Support from natal and marital families is more likely to be based on a combination of family structure and individual family factors. One of the considerations is the woman's financial resources and that of her natal family. Many women were reluctant to ask help from their natal families because of the financial burden that this would invariably place on the natal families.

DV064 (IT): If I had money I would have left home on my own. I would have gone to any relative who stayed close by. My maternal uncle stays here, I would have gone to him. But I could not even do that - so got beatings at home.

Women experiencing intimate terrorism who considered leaving also needed to think of the financial viability of staying with their natal families for a longer period. Husbands, especially in high control violence, were all too aware of the limited options that were available to the women, as is evident in the case below.

DV005 (IT): Yes, Uncle was poor. Once when my husband had beaten me, my uncle came to ask my husband – ‘why he did it?’ So my husband said that he couldn’t control his anger and so he beat me. Then my husband said to him ‘don’t act smart. What have you given your niece?’

If staying with the natal family was not financially viable, most women opted to come back to the marital household, fully aware that they were likely to experience violence in their marital homes. I found that women, especially if they were experiencing intimate terrorism, considered long-term solutions rather than short-term ones. For many women, tolerating the violence was acceptable as long as it ensured a steady income for herself and her children. Therefore, I found that many women experiencing intimate partner violence stayed in their marital homes, despite horrific conditions.

While natal families could not always afford to take care of their daughters permanently, they often tried to help them in small ways.

I: Can you keep money aside and spend it according to your desire?

DV012 (SCV): No. Only if my parents give me, then I have money. My husband never gave me any money.

In addition to financial considerations, women were often dependent on their natal family for emotional support. I found that while women didn’t necessarily leave the relationship, they often went to the natal families for brief visits, usually after an episode of violence. This practice of going to natal families for weddings, small functions, or religious holidays seems to sustain women in their violent relationships.

DV080 (SCV): No. No. Sometimes I used to think that I married this man unnecessarily...We have never gone to see a movie together, never gone for a walk together. Then I used to enjoy with my friends and the people at my mother’s place.

Presence of children

Children were often the central piece that decided women's use of coping strategies.

Additionally, children were often witness to the violence, and in many of the cases where children witnessed or were present during the violence, they intervened.

DV004 (SCV): Two of them were sleeping and the youngest one was awake. She pulled him by his hand and kept saying 'Pappa, please don't' beat mummy. Mummy, please be quiet, go out please'.

The child in this case was only ten years old. For women experiencing situational couple violence, as with DV004, husbands tend to respond to the children, and restrict their violence. But for women experiencing intimate terrorism, the pleas from parents or children didn't really affect them in any way. In these cases, women tried to shield the children from the violence and its aftermath. In one poignant case, when the child tried to console his mother, she told him that her husband was just playing, and that he shouldn't be afraid of his father. In many cases, children act as safeguards against the violence.

DV005 (IT): I used to explain it to my son. Even now when I go to see him, he tells me to directly go back; otherwise my husband will beat you again. My son knows everything. He just exchanges a few words and then asks me to go. He is afraid that if his father sees me, I will get beaten up again.

Children also acted as mediators in the relationship. This tended to happen most frequently with women experiencing situational couple violence. In some contrast, we find that for women experiencing intimate terrorism, children are often used to control the woman, as illustrated in the earlier chapter. When children are used to control, women were often restricted in their coping strategies. For example, many women told us that they wanted to end their lives because of the excessive violence, but the thought of their children stopped them.

I: Did you ever think of committing suicide due to your husband's beating?

DV005 (IT): No, never. I have two children. So, this kind of thinking is not going to help.

Women were also restricted by their children in other ways. For example, if women didn't have any independent means of living, they had to make plans to support themselves and their children. In addition, if women had sons and no independent means of livelihood, they had to reconcile themselves to being separated from them. For women who were primarily responsible for their children, a few of them waited for their daughters to be married and their sons to earn their livelihood to consider leaving the relationship.

DV009: They are well. I have no worry about them. Only one daughter is yet to be married. Shall I work till old age? My son is only 12 years. How long will it take for him to grow up and start earning? Till then, I need to continue my work.

In the meantime, they strategized to make sure that they were being taken care of financially. Women often leave the relationship only if their husbands do not financially support them. This was true for both situational couple violence and intimate terrorism.

DV009 (IT): What to do? I used to pass days. Once my daughters get married, my problem will be solved. Now, I've got a rented place. Now I told him he can do whatever he wants to do.

In this case, DV009 did leave the relationship that she had with her husband when she realized that her husband wasn't supporting her, she set up an independent household. Although he was still violent towards her, she had begun to shout back and in one instance, beat him with a heavy stick when he came to the house. So, for many women, their coping strategies reflected their choices with regard to their children.

MARITAL CONTEXT

Arrangement of marriage

In India, marriages are often arranged through family networks. Marriages are often arranged keeping in mind, among other things, the caste, class and the family 'name' of the

marital family. In addition, since the practice of dowry is alive and well in most urban and rural communities, women were often married to their husbands in response to financial burdens of the family. For example, one of the women in the study who had six sisters was married to her husband at the age of 12 so that her father could get his daughters married before he retired, after which he would not be able to bear the burden of the wedding and dowry costs. Most of the women in my sample had their marriages arranged by their families. Amongst these women, there were some who were already familiar with their husband's family, either through blood or through other social networks. For most of the young women in the sample, their parents arranged marriages only after an explicit agreement by the women. This was not always the case for the older women, who often did not meet their husbands before the day of the wedding.

DV009 (IT): In those times, parents used to decide with whom the daughter shall marry. New generation girls say I will not marry with such a person, he is no good. In old times, we used to be happy with whatever was our fate. No one ever went to see the would-be spouse.

There were a few women who did choose to marry a man of their choice. In close communities like a rural village or an urban slum, these choices were usually frowned upon, but they were not necessarily ostracized.

This choice of marriage is central to our discussion of women's coping with power and control. Women who chose their husbands tended to be subject to harsher treatment in their marital environment especially if the marriage was conducted without the explicit consent of the marital home. This was true for couples experiencing violence.

I: Did you two fight about money?

DV008 (IT): Yes. He used to say that if he had married a woman from his own caste and he would have got 50,000 or 60,000 rupees as dowry, 'And I had 'love marriage' with you, and I didn't get even five paisa'.

In addition, most of the violent men who had a 'love' marriage tended to be more suspicious of their wives and beat their wives for alleged infidelity. This usually involved curtailing her physical movement outside the household. Typically, the women could not move out of the house without the consent of their husbands. In addition, marrying without the consent of their parents to a husband of their choice had some influence on the financial or emotional resources women could access if they experienced violence. For example, when women who had love marriages approached their natal families for help, the responses from the natal families were not always supportive.

DV008 (IT): I mean, they came to know after I got married. Then they said, 'What can we do now'? She has got married already. Now what's the use'?

In addition to the response of the natal family, women themselves had very similar reactions to the violence when they married the man they had chosen. They often felt compelled to stay with him regardless of circumstances.

V008(IT): : People had seen us together. To go around with one guy and then marrying another one is not good, is it? But he ruined my life. It doesn't matter which caste he belongs to, I had decided to marry him.

On the other end of the spectrum, women typically got support from their parents if their parents were the ones who chose their husband. Interestingly, women didn't blame their parents for the failed or bad marriage. Instead, I found that many women directed their angst towards themselves, or more accurately, their fate. Although I don't have any direct evidence about this, I postulate that this trend is changing. It is likely that as arranged marriages are making a transition to love-arranged marriages, and women have more say in the choice of marriage, these coping dynamics are also likely to change.

Marital expectations

Women's coping is intimately tied to their marital expectations. As illustrated earlier, women are often trained to view their husbands as 'God', and an occasional act of violence by their husband as normal. Indian feminists have critiqued the judicial system for this patriarchal attitude that justifies some forms of violence as 'normal' if used to 'chasten' the woman. Given these beliefs, it is not surprising to see women sometimes justifying the violence perpetrated against them and sometimes complying with their husband's requests.

Some women did not accept justifications for the violence; instead, they often had very clear expectations on how their husband should act. Not only should he stop being violent, he should also live up to being a good husband. In addition to the reduction in the violence, women (especially those who were experiencing intimate terrorism) wanted to be part of their husband's life, or at least of the marital household. This usually translated to a share in the financial resources that husbands often denied them.

DV009 (IT): I used to tell [him] now our girls are grown up. Don't fight. I used to explain in many ways, but he was not accepting. He was beyond any logical thing. Since there were 2 houses, I asked him to give me one. He said that if you are not coming to this home, I will not give you the other house.

As mentioned earlier, most of the legal actions that women took against their husbands were regarding return to the marital home, alimony, or child support. Even when women realized that their petitions were likely to take a lot of time, and there was little chance of immediate gratification, they persisted in filing the suits. Part of the reason was that they wanted their rights asserted. The second reason was that women experiencing violence (regardless of controlling contexts) didn't lose hope or the expectation that their husbands would accept them as their wives, and be good husbands. For example, DV008 was being bribed by her husband to drop her lawsuit regarding the right to return to the

marital home, and was offering her a lot of money (given her current finances) to drop the lawsuit

AshaTai: Are you going to be quiet if he pays you Rs. 1.5 to 2 lakh?

DV008 (IT): No. I don't want his money. We will stay anywhere else. We will beg and feed ourselves. But his family should leave him alone.

As she asserts here, it is not necessarily for the monetary gain that women take legal action. Most women who were filing legal suits did not want to leave their households. In many cases, they were abandoned by their husbands, or had left their husbands because they were unable to bear the violence. Most of the time, they told us that they wanted their husbands to actually act like their husbands. And these marital expectations were based on fairly stereotypical notions of what a husband should be. For example, if men fulfilled the basics of their patriarchal duties – earn money, take care of the family, and be stable – women were quite happy.

DV071 (IT): I don't think that I will be happy if I go back to him. And I am so disillusioned within that I don't have the slightest desire to go back to him. I didn't want money, gold or silver from him. All I wanted was loving and caring husband. He couldn't give that to me. And then how is he going to take care of me throughout my life?

For women like DV071 experiencing intimate terrorism, these basic expectations were often not met. Because women were unable to control their husbands, they tried to change their own behavior to accommodate their husband's needs. As in the United States, Indian women experiencing intimate terrorism start to see that no amount of behavior modification is going to change their husbands or the marital relationship.

DV005 (IT): Not only when I make a mistake...he beats me whenever he feels like it.

Many of the women experiencing intimate terrorism told us that the violence was quite bearable and that they would understand the violence if they had committed a mistake.

But they were unable to accept the frequency, the severity, and the reasons for the beatings, when there seemed no ‘valid’ reason to beat.

DV009 (IT): No specific reason! If I came late from work, then he used to quarrel. He didn’t allow me inside the house. He used to go to stay at my workplace. He would chase me on various pretexts like – this lunch was not good, salt was more, spice was more etc – and started fighting.

For women who were dealing with violence they didn’t understand, and who had financial resources from their natal families, leaving became an option. Women who didn’t have the financial resources opted to comply with their husband’s demands. This was often true for women experiencing situational couple violence, where women often complied with their husband’s wishes to keep the peace. Marital expectations, thus, were not only critical in evaluating their husband’s behavior, but also were used to monitor their own behavior. In addition, women were also given incentives from their husbands to behave ‘well’.

I: Is he a very calm person?

DV057 (SCV): Very calm person. Cool headed. I do everything according to his thinking. He is very calm. If he says this is not to be done then I don’t do it.

I: Is that why you don’t have any fights?

DV057 (SCV): Yes.

In this case, his good behavior is contingent upon hers. However, compliance is not the only coping technique that women experiencing intimate terrorism used.

Along with conciliatory behaviors, women experiencing intimate terrorism also used confrontational techniques.

DV014: Yes, even I have beaten him. Once when I was pregnant, he came home completely drunk and vomited in the house. So I beat him saying that I have been waiting for you to come home so we can have dinner.

While not very prevalent, women did hit back in frustration (n = 7). This was true especially for women dealing with drunken husbands. In these cases, women experiencing intimate terrorism (and occasionally, situational couple violence) were usually acting out of frustration. It must be noted that DV014 didn't intend to tell us that she had hit her husband. Her friends who were sitting close by pointed it out. She looked very embarrassed and told us in a defensive voice. I postulate that this might be one of the reasons for the lack of evidence about physical retaliation from wives: the social stigma associated with fighting back, coupled with the marital expectation of the duties and behaviors of a good wife makes women reluctant to fight back and also tell other individuals if they did.

Marital communication and arguments

Marital communication or marital arguments is another way of understanding the marital context within which women strategize their coping in response to violence. I found that for women experiencing intimate terrorism, there were three forms of communication from husbands that they had to deal with: silence, gestures, and instruction. Women often used negotiating or conciliatory behaviors in response to these forms of communication. Negotiating behavior was difficult for women when they were met with silence. For example:

I: Or he might be saying something to you?

DV036 (IT): No, nothing of that sort. He fell short of time talking to his mother, then when would he have time for me?

Intimate terrorists who used silence tended to neglect their wives, usually depriving them of financial resources as well as emotional sustenance. Most women encountering this form of marital communication tended to behave according to their husband's wishes. They based their current behaviors on past behaviors that had been critiqued by their husband.

Women who were dealing with communication that mostly consisted of their husband's actions rather than words also used this tactic.

I: What does he do if you don't behave according to his wishes?

DV036 (IT): He gets irritated. He doesn't beat me. But looks at me with furious eyes, so that I know that he is angry. If I hadn't done this particular thing, then he wouldn't have got angry.

In this case, the husband of DV036 is able to use both techniques of silence and gestures quite effectively to garner her compliance. The compliance behavior in this case is almost inevitable, since there is nothing to negotiate with. It is difficult, even for an outsider, to figure out how women can resist control tactics that are not articulated into words, threats, or action (of violence). In these scenarios, women experiencing intimate terrorism were most likely to be hyper-vigilant of all of their actions, as they were not given very clear indications on the 'proper' thing to do. Clearly, DV036 is aware of this silence being problematic.

I: What was right and what was wrong?

DV036: I mean...when he scolded me- sometimes I too make mistake. If some one explains that to us then we benefit from that. If I say something wrong and then he scolds me about it, then I don't need to say anything at all, but if I don't make a mistake and then he scolds and I listen to it- that's difficult.

For women dealing with words, these forms of marital communication and arguments have a two-pronged effect. While the women are given clear indications for proper behavior, their displeasure at having to comply with everything is usually unheard or not paid attention to.

I: What do you do when he beats you? Do you behave as he wishes...?

DV070 (IT): No. I try to explain things to him nicely and he insists on doing what he wants me to do. I ask him to listen to me sometimes

so that we can live together peacefully. But he doesn't allow me to do anything. He insists on only what he wishes to be done.

But words do give the women some room with which to negotiate. As the example above indicates, DV070 was able to present an alternate picture of a married life to the version that her husband indicates, and she is also able to present her frustration about the power differences in the marital communication. We don't see this all-or-nothing approach to marital communication in instances of situational couple violence.

I: Do you fight about household work/responsibilities?

DV017 (SCV): Yes, we do. But not too much. Just a little bit. That means when I was ill, I felt that my husband should have helped me a little bit. But he doesn't do it. We fight over it.

Here, the instances of marital communication are reminiscent of marital compromise that is characteristic of any marital relationship. Thus, the ways in which couples communicate not only indicate women's experience of control, but also influence their choice of coping.

COPING EFFICACY AND RESTRICTIONS

The efficacy of coping strategies cannot be examined without understanding the restrictions that women face. Although some of these issues have already been discussed, they will be further discussed here in terms of effectiveness in dealing with violence, or reducing violence.

Monetary considerations

As mentioned earlier, financial considerations were one of the most important factors that women had to weigh before deciding the best course of action with regard to violence. For women experiencing intimate terrorism, leaving was one of the most effective ways of ending the violence, because within such a relationship very few women are likely to reduce the control that accompanies the violence. Even if the violence was reduced, women could potentially be left with the high control environment. But leaving the relationship was

a luxury that few women could actively consider. Primary amongst the considerations was monetary restrictions. Unlike women in the U.S., small steps like saving money were not really part of their repertoire of coping strategies, partly because they had insufficient money so that a part of it could be saved, and partly because they had no access to income.

I: Can you save some money and then spend it according to your own desire?

DV070 (IT): No. I don't have money – how can I save any?

But women realized the value of money. Many women argued that if they had access to money, they would be more likely to explore the option of leaving. Money could either help them to set up for themselves and their children, or help their natal families to cope with the burden of supporting an additional member.

I: How would it have helped?

DV063 (IT): If I had money I would have left home on my own. I would have gone to any relative who stayed close by. My maternal uncle stays here, I would have gone to him. But I could not even do that-so got beatings at home.

The money that they needed also translated to more security for their children. Many women who did have access to money because of their labor force participation didn't have *enough*, not to support an entire family, including the children. The crucial aspect is not necessarily to have access to money, but to have access to *sufficient* money. The lack of finances also restricted the natal family's ability to help the women in these violent relationships.

DV005 (IT): My husband used to say that he beat me in a fit of anger. Come back now. I have calmed down. My uncle was poor. He used to say, 'Let it be! It's ok once in a while' and send me back. I used to tell him, 'I don't want to go back. They beat me up so much'.

In the case of DV005, her uncle was one of the members of the family who was very supportive of her, and had, on previous occasions, confronted her husband about the abuse.

But he, as with many members of natal families, felt helpless in the face of financial restrictions. Primarily driven by this financial consideration, many of the women who had been abandoned or who left their husbands filed suits to get alimony as well as child support.

I: For your own sake or for children's education or marriage, you are going to need money. What have you thought on those lines about your future?

DV005 (IT): File a suit claiming the money needed for son's education and for daughter's wedding.

However, women found that husbands were not very responsive to the lawsuits. This was true especially if the husband had been negligent during the marriage. However, there were a few cases in which the court had mandated that the wives be given a portion of his paycheck even before it comes to his hand. These success stories impelled other women to try their luck. But this success was restricted to only three women in my sample, although I heard more success stories in the organizations through informal channels of communication. Women were cognizant that the husband who was negligent during the marriage was not likely to be responsible after the dissolution of the marriage. For example, many women realized that approaching formal networks for help didn't always help them; instead, it often complicated things.

I: Did you ever try to leave him?

DV009 (IT): I tried hundred times. But he never allowed me to go. Once I beat him and then I filed police complaint. So police also beat him. Then he expelled me from the house. Then I didn't go back. He used to lock the door and run away. For eight days, he went to the village. Where would I stay?

But some of the women in my sample decided to pursue this course of action. This was partly because there were very few alternatives.

The other reason for not pursuing a legal course of action is that Indian families, in general, do not like to be embroiled in any legal matter. Most Indian families have a healthy fear of government, the legal system, and the police, because going to those agencies involves making very 'private' things public. Unless the marital family was powerful in the town or village or was connected to the political machine, it was unlikely that the husband would be intimidated enough by the judicial process to comply with the wishes of the court. As mentioned before, most of the women in my sample who went to the courts were still waging the legal war, and so it is not clear how many women would be able to pursue this alternative successfully.

Familial considerations

A critical element of coping was using familial networks, and often the success of any coping strategy, whether conciliatory, resistant, or negotiating, depended on the women's access to or possession of familial resources. Before women reached out to the family networks, they often weighed the utility of these networks. For example, in this case, we see that DV009 didn't take any help from her natal or marital family, because she didn't think the solution was financially viable.

DV009 (IT): I complained to police. He was not listening to anyone else.

I: Did you ever tell this to your mother?

DV009(IT): My mother was poor.

I: Told your in-laws?

DV009(IT): My in-laws were poor. There was no use in telling them these facts.

In addition, women had to contend with the familial roles that often interacted with justifications for the violence. For example, families were very cognizant about ensuring that

private matters such as violence were not be made public. But the boundaries for what is considered private and public may be blurred in a joint family system.

DV076 (IT): Then I used to tell my mother-in-law. She used to try to tell him not to beat. But he used to say “She is my wife. I will beat her. It is none of your business.”

Since the violence is still situated within the marital home, it is considered private. But as with the husband of DV076, there are some boundaries around the marital relationship that also seem to fall into public and private space. While the violence might happen within the physical space of a household, it can often be treated as private matter between the two spouses within that relationship. And as witnessed in the example, DV076’s husband was able to use this characteristic of the division of public and private space of a family structure to his advantage. This separation of private and public space even within the household drastically inhibits women’s use of familial social networks as well as any negotiating techniques that she could use to control the violence.

Other familial networks such as the presence of their children also bind women. As mentioned earlier in this section, children often are the driving force behind deciding to stay in the relationship or leave the relationship.

DV012 (SCV): Even if I have such thoughts, I told myself that I have a son who would get good education in the city and not here in the village. So, I stay there. Many times, I have compromised here in the organization and gone back there.

For women who choose to go back to their violent relationship, one of the primary considerations is the trade-off between not being able to sustain their livelihood and support their children versus coping with the violence. In many cases, it is a clear choice, especially if one starts to consider the life for a poor divorced/separated woman working to support her children’s education and possibly saving for a dowry. Part of the reason that women do not have the luxury of leaving a violent partner is the lack of women’s choices outside of

marriage. However, lack of alternatives is not the only consideration. Some women, as I present in the next section, do have emotional attachments to their husbands that weigh in heavily on the choice of coping strategy.

Emotional considerations

It should not come as a surprise that women's reactions to the violence were very emotional, and therefore, it is likely that the coping strategies that they chose were also grounded in these emotions. The most evocative stories of survivors were the ones where women showed absolutely no emotion. Usually, women who were experiencing intimate terrorism were very sad, angry, and at the same time, accepting of their fate. But there were a few women who didn't register any emotion.

I: What reasons does your husband tell you for beating you?

DV030 (IT): No reasons.

I: What do think may be the reasons?

DV030: What am I going to think? I don't feel anything.

Because only 20 women consented to the second interview, I only have partial information on women's mental health. I can only speculate that these women that I encountered who didn't seem to show any emotion were likely to be experiencing some symptoms of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), a very common symptom among victims of domestic violence. It is not possible to find out whether women's emotional state was the cause or symptom of their coping strategy, but it is an important piece of information that can give us a greater insight into the process of coping.

Women experiencing intimate terrorism who blamed themselves for the violence did not feel angry at their situation, their husband, or at their family. They usually registered

frustration or impatience. But for women who did know that the violence had no purpose, anger was the first reaction.

DV005 (IT): I used to get real mad at him. I felt that I should not live ...I come from good family, so I must behave well.

This invocation of being from a good family is not a coincidence. Many women felt conflicted about wanting to leave, knowing that leaving would involve the loss of the good name of the family. The institution of marriage in India is often considered inviolable. It would not be an overstatement to say that women have no primary identity outside of marriage. In addition, this identity is not only tied with their individual self, but also their families and communities. When women experience the trauma and betrayal of domestic violence, they have to reconceptualize their life, not only in terms of their own selves, but also the possible impact that their decisions might have on their families and communities. For example, Siddhi, whose husband wanted to marry his sister, told us that her first reaction was this:

DV004: Then [DV004's sister] said, 'yes. If I marry, I will marry only [DV004's husband]'. Then I thought my own sister has done this, how will I face my five sisters-in-law, four brothers-in-law and my mother-in-law? Where will I go with my two children?

In this case, DV004 decided to get her sister married to her husband and live separately from them to help protect her sister from censure. Unfortunately for Siddhi, this move was also fraught with difficulties. Women are socialized to be dependent either on their natal or marital families, and any act of independence can be met with retaliation through violence (as was the case with Siddhi). Even if the act of independence is in self-preservation, women face strong pull *and* push factors for staying within the marriage.

DV071 (IT): What are these girls supposed to do? How is one supposed to trust 'the men?' Do you keep leaving one man and then another and then still another? And if you do such a thing, then a woman becomes a target of ridicule in the society. What are these girls

supposed to do then? If they decide to end their lives and don't succeed in their attempt, then should they continue with the remaining half of their life in the same misery? Since they don't have sufficient educational qualification, they don't get a good job. You get either Rs.40 or 50 or at the most 60 per day. How does one survive in this world within that kind of income? How do we face these difficulties?

As DV071 puts it so eloquently, women dealing with violence are often put between a rock and a hard place. Any action they take against the violence is rife with problems. But most women who become pragmatic about an emotional relationship acknowledge that the costs of leaving a relationship are much greater than the costs of staying in a relationship.

Thus, women are much more likely to stay in the relationship and use strategies that help them to cope with the violence within the family structure. This, however, does not mean that the women are blindly accepting of the diminished choices in dealing with the violence.

DV071 (IT): Yes, because there is no point in trusting this man. I go back to him and he repeats the same story again. Now I work and live happily. I won't get that happiness there. I have given him 500 opportunities in 5 years to change for better. But he didn't.

For women who are ready to leave and have gathered the financial, mental, and emotional resources to leave the relationship, formal institutions are essential, because they provide a source of validation and direction for women's coping.

DV001 (IT): Then when I came here [to the organization], I started understanding that there are many people like me. Then, one also has to understand oneself and realize that nothing can be done at this point. All these people supported me and that's why I came up here.

While this source of support is essential for women, the more pertinent of the resources that are likely to be useful to women when coping with violence (either by staying or leaving) are the informal networks. These informal networks are the most accessible and

are likely to provide solutions that cater not only to women's financial needs, but also emotional ones.

Some women ($n = 8$), despite their experience of horrific violence were attached to their husbands and they wanted to stay with their husbands not because they were forced to, but because they wanted to. This was evident when women confessed (quite sheepishly) that they continued to meet with their husbands despite the separation. Although some of these meetings ended with violence (in one instance, he threw rocks at her on the street) others ended up in more ambiguous relationships. For example, after DV009 legally separated from her husband and set up an independent household, she had four more children with her ex-husband. Part of the ambiguity was guided by hope that the men would turn out to be good husbands.

I: When you were staying with your husband, then did you feel that beatings would stop one day?

DV005: Oh! Yes! I did feel that sometime or the other, there would be peaceful atmosphere; my husband would talk to me nicely. I keep on tolerating things because I felt so. But later, this went on increasing.

This feeling of longing is especially present in interviews for women who did not leave their homes voluntarily. As mentioned earlier, in the case of DV012, despite the warnings of her mother-in-law, DV012, who was experiencing severe abuse continued to stay with her (drug-addicted, alcoholic, gambler) husband because she said that her parents' house is not her house. Her parents were quite able and willing to support her and were actively encouraging her not only to leave her husband, but also to marry someone else. But she was quite adamant about staying with her husband.

In other cases, women kept waiting for some resolution, because they were still reluctant to divorce their husbands (although they were separated). In one poignant case:

I: Now you have left home and not returned, so what was your husband's reaction?

DV005 (IT): I thought he might come to take me back today or tomorrow, but he never came.

I: Do you still feel that he might come?

DV005 (IT): No, now I don't think so...

These ambiguities are often indicative of the complicated relationship that exists between women's agency, their experience of domestic violence, and the influence of the larger patriarchal structure.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

One of the main findings of these analyses is the documentation of various coping strategies that are used by Indian women in response to situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. For example, in addition to the help-seeking, conciliatory, resistance, and leaving behaviors (that have already been documented in the U.S. and India), I found that negotiating and independent behaviors were also used by women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. Women experiencing situational couple violence didn't use a wide range of coping strategies, probably because the violence was usually sporadic, and long-term coping strategies were unnecessary. For women experiencing intimate terrorism, I found that most used a wide range of tactics and they often employed them strategically, based on familial, cultural, and personal constraints.

One of the major factors that determined women's coping strategies is their access to financial and familial resources. If women had one of the two resources (familial or financial), they were more likely to take proactive steps to either end the relationship or to end the violence within the relationship. All of these strategies were weighed against the particular social context. For example, rural women were not very likely to leave the marital

relationship, because the social networks are not usually supportive of unattached women. Women used resistance behaviors sparingly, not only because of social stigma of hitting their husband, but also because they were beaten more severely when they resisted.

Leaving and compliance behaviors were more popular coping strategies, especially for women experiencing intimate terrorism. Women who left the relationship usually approached the police or women's groups for help. Mediation or legal action were the most frequently used techniques employed by these formal networks. Both of these actions had mixed results. While mediation is probably a good technique for women experiencing situational couple violence, women experiencing intimate terrorism found that it was not very helpful. In addition, the paternalistic and patriarchal attitudes of the judicial system often dissuaded women from pursuing any legal action against their husbands. Despite these limitations, many women in my study pursued these options. Lastly, women's emotional responses to the marital relationship and to their husband played a critical role in their choice and strategies of coping.

In order for us to understand the ways in which the different kinds of control contexts and the different kinds of coping that women use, we must examine each of these processes in a more holistic manner. In order to accomplish this task, three cases exemplifying different types of domestic violence will be examined in the next chapter.

Utterance

Sitting over words
very late I have heard a kind of whispered sighing
not far
like a night wind in pines or like the sea in the dark
the echo of everything that has ever
been spoken
still spinning its one syllable
between the earth and silence

W. S. Merwin

Chapter 7

THE INTERACTIVE NATURE OF CONTROL, VIOLENCE, AND AGENCY **Examining three case studies**

While the comparison of themes in narratives of domestic violence describes the dynamics of domestic violence, the individual examination of cases captures the interaction of women's actions with the dynamics of control and violence. In this chapter, I examine three cases that embody respectively situational couple violence, alcohol-related violence, and intimate terrorism. By analyzing each of these cases, I illustrate the complexities that are inherent in the relationships among agency, patriarchal control, and domestic violence. I first describe the lives of each of the women, and then examine the differences with respect to the violence they experience, their marital contexts, their familial contexts, and the different coping strategies that they use.

DV004 “Hasini”: SITUATIONAL COUPLE VIOLENCE

Description of Hasini

I have dubbed DV004 as “Hasini” (roughly translated from Hindi as laughing) primarily because of her demeanor during my interactions with her. Hasini is a short, vivacious woman who always greeted us with a big grin. My interactions with her extended beyond the two interviews that I did with her because she worked as an assistant cook at Maval micro-credit union at the Somatne site. I ran into her every time I went to the Somatne site. She was recruited for the study because she had experienced an incident of violence a few weeks prior to my arrival.

Hasini's marriage is one of the few inter-caste, inter-region, inter-language, love/arranged marriages in the study. The reason it was a love/arranged marriage was because of her husband's interest in marrying her. Hasini's husband was supposed to marry

someone else, but he had seen her at the wedding of his brother and he informed his parents that he would not marry anyone else but Hasini. Initially, she was not very keen on marrying him because he came from another community and she would have to leave her village, but her parents didn't oppose the marriage, so she agreed to marry him.

Hasini describes her marriage as a happy one. She told us that she had been married for 10 years, and all those years, he had been very loving. But a few years ago, his parents had come to live with them. The additional financial stress as well as the abrasive behavior of her mother-in-law was slowly affecting their relationship. She told us that her husband had become a bit irritable, and does not always treat her as well as he used to. He has started to get a little rough with her, shouting at her, and at the time of the second interview, he had hit her twice.

With respect to family characteristics such as decision-making in the household or physical mobility, Hasini was severely limited. She could not go to the village market if she wanted to go. She made all her decisions jointly with her husband. While they managed to live well financially speaking, she took up the part-time job as a cook to supplement the income her husband was bringing in. With respect to personal characteristics, Hasini could not read or write. She had never been to school. The jobs that she took up on a part-time basis were farming and cooking. She was working at her present job at the organization against her husband's wishes. Her husband wanted her to take care of the household full-time, but because his earnings were not sufficient, she was forced to work to make sure her children were well provided for.

With regard to distribution of earnings, her husband gave her all the money he earned and did most of the decision-making. Usually, we find that husbands are not involved in domestic chores, which are considered 'women's chores. But Hasini's husband

was involved in all aspects of the household, and occasionally helped her out with her chores, including preparing food.

Hasini was very emphatic in her assertions that her husband did not control her in any of the seven dimensions that we mentioned. She admitted as an afterthought that while he didn't really control her in any way, he was a little possessive, prone to jealousy if he didn't know what she was doing. At the end of the interview, when we asked Hasini if she was happy with her husband, she told us she could not have found a more loving husband, and so she was very happy. In addition, she was one of the very few women who told us that her husband was very demonstrative with his love and often told her that he loved her.

Violence experienced by Hasini

The first violent incident in the relationship happened ten years into the marriage. She had gone to work in the fields as a part-time farmer to boost their income, after he had specifically asked her not to work in the fields. He had told her that he was worried that there would be nobody in the home to take care of the children (whom he adored), so he didn't want her to leave the house in search of work. As long as she worked close to the house, he was fine because she could keep an eye on their children. When he found out that she had worked in the fields (which were situated far from the house), he hit her.

At the time of the first interview, Hasini insisted that he was justified in his use of the violence, and because she felt that her husband loved her very much, it was not likely that the violence would happen again. Between her first and second interview, she was assaulted once more. At the time of the second interview (three days after the violent incident), she seemed a little more hesitant about stating that the violence would not happen again.

The reason for the second assault involved her mother-in-law. Hasini's husband had a fight with her mother-in-law who had complained that Hasini had not bought shoes for her mother-in-law when they had gone shopping earlier in the day. When her husband defended Hasini, her mother-in-law told her son that he was not taking care of his own family and was only listening to his wife and accused him of being a hen-pecked husband. When Hasini tried to defend herself against these allegations, her husband told her to keep quiet. When she didn't, he beat her severely. In response, she ran away from the house and hid in the bathroom of the Somatne office. Only after her young daughter came in search of her, did she come out of her hiding place. She went back to the house, and her husband took her to the hospital. She had a concussion, and when she came in for the second interview, she still had a lot of bruises around her face, neck, and arms.

When we asked Hasini about her husband's reaction to the violence, she told us that he was filled with remorse after the assault, and had made amends with her to rectify what he perceived to be his mistake. In addition, she was empathetic to his situation. She told us that she felt closer to him after he had apologized to her.

She felt that the violence was mainly due to the additional members in the household and the fact that he was drunk the night he beat her. She told us that he never would have hit her if he had not been intoxicated that night. When the caseworkers at the Somatne office tried to convince her to tell her husband to stop consuming alcohol, she insisted that he did not drink frequently. Hasini told us that he only drank when he was at home. That night was the only exception when he had gone drinking with his friends. When she was describing the assault and the aftermath, she looked a little sad and preoccupied. She appeared to be cheerful again in my subsequent trips to the office, and she greeted us with smiles in her characteristic manner.

DV007 “Vinaya”: ALCOHOL-RELATED VIOLENCE***Description of Vinaya***

For the purpose of this case-study, I will refer to DV007 as “Vinaya”, meaning modest or unassuming. Vinaya is a small thin woman in her early 40s, although she looked much older than her years. She did not wear any kind of jewelry (not even a mangalsutra – the traditional marriage thread), noticeable by their absence. She was very sad during the entire interview. She lives with her two sons and her alcoholic husband who drinks all day and steals money from the household.

Vinaya could read and write and had completed the seventh grade. Her father-in-law arranged the marriage. She knew her husband before she married him, because their families were related on her father’s side. She was happy with her marriage when she got married. In the beginning, they argued mostly about money, but when he started to drink, they also argued about his alcohol use and about his lack of work. He didn’t contribute to the household in any way, and encouraged her to work so that he could get access to her income. Vinaya earns most of the money in the household by peddling some wares and working as a maid in some houses. When Vinaya’s husband managed to find work as a day laborer (usually working on construction sites), he spent it all on alcohol.

With regard to socioeconomic status, while she was earning enough to support herself and her two sons, she did not keep anything in her house (not even a clock). This was because anything she bought would eventually be sold to fuel her husband’s addiction. Since her husband didn’t earn any money, she made all the decisions in the household and did not need permission to go anywhere. Vinaya told us that her husband was hardly aware of his

own surroundings; so he never bothered to find out where she went. In Vinaya's case, the question of controlling her movements, being jealous or suspicious did not arise at all.

Violence experienced by Vinaya

Vinaya's husband only beats her when he is drinking or wants money to drink. Sometimes, he comes home drunk and starts an argument with her and starts to beat her. All of her neighbors knew of his drinking habits and would frequently try to stop him from beating her. In addition, she had also approached her parents for help regarding his alcoholism. She occasionally fights back and often tells her sons to beat him up. Vinaya was one of the few women who were open about admitting that she withheld sex in response to violence.

Her husband was immune to any and all of her efforts to stop the violence and the consumption of alcohol. According to her descriptions, he only drinks and sleeps, and that was the extent of his reaction to her. Vinaya has often thought of leaving, but never attempted to do so because the children have grown up and she didn't want to leave them. This seems counter to all the narratives of coping in the study. Usually, women didn't want to leave their husbands because the children were too young and the women didn't have the financial means to support them. But when they grew older, women were more confident about leaving. In this case, the sons had started to earn their own livelihoods and for all intents and purposes, were leading their lives without the father.

Yet, Vinaya did not make any effort to leave the household. In addition, Vinaya told us that while she gets along with her husband most of the time, she didn't necessarily trust him. She wishes her husband was not an alcoholic, but she doesn't regret marrying him. She seemed fairly resigned to the state of her marital relationship. Although the community around her was very supportive of her, she had no hope that the violence would end.

DV014 “Dhriti”: INTIMATE TERRORISM*Description of Dhriti*

“Dhriti” (meaning courage) was not recruited by the case workers in the corporation office, nor did she know anyone we had interviewed earlier. She burst into our office, mistaking us for caseworkers. After we explained our research to her, she agreed to do the interview while she was waiting for the caseworker to deal with her case. She was accompanied by her mother who also occasionally contributed to the interview. Dhriti was a short woman, thin, and very energetic. As soon as she entered the room, she started chatting with us as if she had known us for a long time, and while both her parents were present at the interview, she didn’t hesitate to criticize them for their poor handling of the situation.

Before her separation from her husband, Dhriti had been living with her husband and six of her marital family members and her two sons for 10 years. Her husband was the neighbor of one of her relatives, and she had met him at this relative’s house. They liked each other and had a love marriage. She told us that she was very unhappy with her husband right from the very beginning. There were constant fights about money, alcohol use, his jobs, and her social life. She had attended school till the 10th grade. She hadn’t been allowed to work when she was living with her husband, but since the separation had been supporting herself working as a housemaid.

When she was living within her marital household, her mother-in-law made all the decisions in the household and Dhriti was not allowed to go anywhere and needed permission to go to the market or to see her relatives. Her husband had tried to control her in every way and he tried to restrict her movements.

Dhriti was filing a case against her husband to regain custody of her two children. She told us that her husband had kidnapped them and taken them to his natal home, and recently had threatened her with bodily harm if she didn't withdraw her case against him. She had come to the organization to follow up on the case.

Violence experienced by Dhriti

Dhriti was hit by her mother-in-law, her sister-in-law, her brother-in-law and her husband. While her husband perpetrated most of the violence, the rest of the marital family had hit her at least once or twice. The most unique characteristic about her husband's violence was that he did not beat her when he drank. In fact, he was very calm and composed when he was drunk. He beat her only when he was sober. I didn't find this pattern in any other case in the study.

The violence and the control contexts that Dhriti experienced were particularly vicious. Right from the beginning, Dhriti was not treated very well by her in-laws. Because she had married of her own accord, her marital family members were extremely hostile towards her. Right from the very beginning, they controlled her actions in the house and were verbally, physically, and emotionally abusive. Even after the birth of her two sons, there was no change in the treatment at home. Finally, she convinced her husband to leave the joint family in Bombay and shift into a nuclear family in Pune a few years prior to the interview. For the first two years, she said that the family situation improved dramatically. Her husband did not abuse her when they were living separately from his family. But one day without telling her or her family, he took both the children to Bombay. She was working at the time; when she came home, she found her husband and her children missing. Since then, she has been trying to get custody of her children.

Prior to this incident, her husband had started to become verbally and emotionally abusive. After two years in Pune, he told her that he didn't want to be separated from his natal family and started pressuring her to move with him. But she was afraid of moving back with him to Bombay because of the controlling behaviors of her marital family.

On one occasion, she had sustained an open wound when her mother-in-law beat her. When Dhriti requested treatment for her injuries, her mother-in-law rubbed some chili powder on the wounds, and told her that the application would take care of all of her wounds. In another incident, her husband's family had told her to sign some blank legal papers. When she refused, her husband along with his mother held a can of kerosene in one hand and told her they would pour it on her and light a match if she didn't comply.

These signed blank papers were being used to document that Dhriti's family had harassed her husband, and her husband had testified that Dhriti signed the papers as testimony of her family's ill-treatment of her husband. So, Dhriti was not only trying to get custody of her children, she was also trying to legally refute these allegations.

In addition to these legal troubles, her husband's family had threatened to disrupt the wedding of Dhriti's brother by spreading false rumors about her brother's character. Since her natal family and her marital family were neighbors in Bombay, it was a particularly tense situation. To make matters worse, Dhriti had recently received death threats from her husband. He had told her that if she was living, he would feel ashamed as a man; so he had to kill her so that he could live. The Marathi version of this threat is quite powerful, and the intent and the severity of this threat do not actually translate very well into English.

Even while she was telling us these horrific stories, Dhriti seemed confident in her abilities to cope with the legal battle that she was facing. She told us that she had considered the possibility of reconciling with her husband. But after he kidnapped her children, she had

lost all faith in him. In order to cope with the violence, she was very active in recruiting help. She told us that she would get very angry immediately after the violence, but tried to comply as much as she could when she was living in the marital household. She told us that her natal family was very supportive, and that she had often confided in her mother about the most severe incidents of violence.

She was one of the few individuals who told us that she used a number of tactics to decrease the violence, and she used them strategically. She tried complying, using silence, apologizing. But in addition, she also argued back, or fought back. Depending on the circumstance and the kinds of resources she had at hand, she would change her coping technique. Until recently, her natal family had not supported her. They believed that because she was so gregarious, she was being 'disciplined'. But when her children were taken from her, they seemed to have been convinced of her stories about the marital home.

One of the unique features in this case was that Dhriti had a very strong presence; she was confident and was unhesitant about telling her story. She told us that because of her outgoing personality, she was often at odds with her marital family. While she had been controlled in many ways, and experienced some of the most severe incidents of violence in the study, there was no hint of obeisance in her manner, voice, or her persona.

INTERACTIVE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTROL AND VIOLENCE

While the general differences among these cases are quite apparent, in this section I will examine more specifically five aspects of each case: (1) the progression and characteristics of violence, (2) specific control tactics used by husbands, (3) family

characteristics such as family structure (4) marital characteristics such as marital happiness, and (5) coping strategies.

Progression and characteristics of violence

The characteristics of the violence varied dramatically across the three cases. For Dhriti, who was experiencing intimate terrorism, the types of violence included but were not limited to slapping, pushing, hitting and throwing objects. It also included various forms of physical acts such as threats to kill her, kidnapping her children and stealing valuables from her.

I: Oh! Does it mean that your husband has taken your children along with him to village?

DV014 (IT): Yes. He has even taken the mangalsutra (sacred golden chain with black beads) and he beat me up before leaving.

The mangalsutra is one of the most important symbols of marriage along with the vermilion on the forehead. Without the mangalsutra, Hindu women are considered widows, and consequently, outcasts. Taking the mangalsutra not only affects her immediate marital status, but also her social status outside the marital home. By taking the mangalsutra, Dhriti's husband was able to convey very clearly that he no longer was in a relationship with her. Coupled with kidnapping of the children, this proved to be one of the most traumatic acts of emotional abuse from her husband.

The physical abuse was also ever-present. While she experienced horrific levels of abuse from her husband, Dhriti continued to live with the fear that her husband could be violent towards her again. Even after abandoning Dhriti, the threats of beating her up or killing her were ever-present.

This is in sharp contrast to the violence that Hasini or Vinaya experienced. The former experienced two instances of beating, while the latter experienced chronic, but not

severe forms of violence. In both the cases, alcohol seems to have been involved, but the relationship between alcohol and patriarchal control was quite different in the two cases.

For Hasini, although there were only two incidents of violence, they were used instrumentally. The purpose of the violence was to reinforce patriarchal norms in the household. The first incident was in response to failure of Hasini to do her duty as a mother as her husband perceived it, and the second incident was in response to a direct provocation to his 'manhood' not only by his mother, but also by his wife. The violence exerted in the second incident was exercised to reinforce the power and authority of the man in the household in that particular situation. This assertion of authority in one particular incident of violence must not be mistaken for the generalized power and control that intimate terrorists exert over women.

For Vinaya, the violence was also used instrumentally, induced by alcohol, but we don't see any patriarchal norms that are being reinforced through the use of violence. Vinaya's husband did not care about the family in any way; he was strictly focused on getting his drink. The violence that Vinaya experienced was without specific forms of control; instead, the violence was strictly instrumental.

However, the levels of violence that were used against Vinaya were similar to the violence experienced by Dhriti. Vinaya had experienced several forms of violence, including slapping, kicking, and beating, just like Dhriti. But for Hasini, the most violent acts consisted of slaps against the face, and hitting on the arm and back. Although they resulted in injuries, the levels of violence for Hasini did not compare to the levels experienced by Vinaya and Dhriti.

In addition, the history of the abuse was different for the women. For Hasini, the first 10 years were characterized by absolutely no physical abuse. For both Vinaya and

Dhriti, the violence was present from the beginning of the relationship, but for very different reasons, the former because of addiction, the latter because of controlling tactics of the husband and marital family.

With regard to verbal or emotional abuse, we find that Hasini had started to experience more marital arguments, but it cannot be classified as verbal abuse partly because Hasini was able to shout or swear back. Both Vinaya and Dhriti experienced verbal abuse, although the nature of the abuse was very different. For Vinaya, these verbal assaults often lacked the potency of real threats. The verbal abuse that Vinaya usually experienced from her drunk husband tended to be accusatory in nature for withholding money from him. For Dhriti, verbal abuse became one of the control tactics used by the husband and his family that in conjunction to the physical assault to solicit her compliance.

In terms of emotional abuse, the emotional abuses experienced by the women were also very different. Hasini did experience some emotional abuse, but it was specific to the incident of the violence. She felt shamed and insulted in front of her marital family, but other forms of emotional abuse such as invalidating, putting her down, and so on, were not part of the violent incident, or the relationship. In addition, Hasini did not seem dispirited by the violence.

I: What happened to you?

DV004 (SCV): Oh! Nothing much. We had an argument about money matters. Nothing else. He beat me because of that. He never behaved in such a bad manner before.

This was not the case for Vinaya. She told us that she often felt despair regarding the relationship. While Vinaya did not experience any threats of bodily injury or emotional blackmail, she was extremely neglected in her relationship, and the emotional abuse consisted mostly of denying her emotional or financial support. Her husband did not care

about the welfare of her or her children. Not only did he neglect his family, he also exploited them financially and emotionally for his addiction. Hence, the emotional abuse was often a product of his addiction, rather than the violence per se. This was not the case with Dhriti. The emotional abuse that she experienced was tied heavily to the violence that she experienced. She has experienced a wide range of emotional abuse such as tactics of minimizing, blaming, denying, and dominating, among others.

The predictability of these forms of violence differed in these cases. The violence for Hasini was not predictable. She did not anticipate the violence when she was hit for the second time. While she was quite confident in the first interview that she would not be hit again, she was no longer sure if that was necessarily true in the second interview. For Vinaya, not only was the violence predictable, she was fairly resigned to the possibility that it would never end. In addition, she knew the reasons for his violence, and could prepare herself for it, if necessary. In some cases, she was able to solicit the help of her neighbors and her sons, if she felt threatened. For Dhriti, the violence was very unpredictable. Dhriti told us that her husband constantly monitored her behavior and she never knew what would trigger his violence. This unpredictability was accentuated also because her husband did not assault her for every transgression. There were a lot of months where her husband did not hit her or berate her in any way. The reasons for the violence were never clear for Dhriti.

Specific control tactics

In conjunction with the physical and emotional violence, the general and specific patterns of control also differ across the cases. The three women experienced varying degrees of control from their husbands, but the manner in which the control was exerted by their husbands or the marital family differed for each woman. For Hasini, there were no generalized patterns of control that her husband exhibited. At the same time, for each

incident of violence, he used the violence based on the power and authority of his position in the hierarchical family structure.

DV004 (SCV): ...He said to his father ‘Ask this oldie [referring to his mother] I give her money all the time’. So then his mother said ‘How do you call me an Oldie? You are your wife’s slave’. When my mother-in-law said this, my husband told me to be quiet and not to say anything. I can’t bear it if someone talks bad about me. So I started crying. Then he asked me stop crying ‘Have I beaten you up? You be quiet. Don’t cry. Saying this, he gave me a light slap...

What is ironic about this narrative is that a good husband is conceptualized by Hasini’s husband as someone who does not beat his wife, and yet his actions immediately thereafter contradict it. In addition, it is very clear from this paragraph that the violence, in this specific incident, is exerted not only to solidify his power and authority in the household with respect to his wife, but also with respect to his mother. Since his mother was calling his power in the household into question, the use of the violence not only asserted his authority over his wife, but also reaffirmed his position with respect to his mother.

While the husband of Hasini was not exerting generalized patterns of control, he was definitely using violence in that single incident to assert control over the relationship and to regain his position of authority as the head of the household. In addition, he able to ensure that Hasini is not likely to speak up during an argument, because she now has a very clear idea about the consequences of speaking up during an argument. And by this self-censure, the incidents of violence may be the beginning of generalized patterns of control. We often think of situational couple violence as a stand-alone phenomenon. However, even if the violence in the beginning was not exercised to assert generalized control over the woman, it is possible that the violence can come to exert generalized control over the woman, regardless of the context in which the violence took place. Even when the violence is a

product of a few specific arguments that escalate, fear of its repetition can lead women to become generally more compliant to the authority of their husbands.

In the case of Hasini's marriage, this does not seem to have happened. She told us at the end of the second interview that her husband had become more loving in the aftermath of the violence.

DV004 (SCV): I keep on nagging him that I want this and I want that. He thinks that once the house is done properly, and then he would give me things even without asking for him and definitely.

The expressiveness of her husband and his actions of love were often repeated by Hasini to reaffirm the strength of their marriage.

When we talked to Vinaya about the specific control contexts in the marital relationship, Vinaya smiled at us and shook her head. She told us that regardless of what she did to him, whether she complied with his requests, or whether she fought back, there was absolutely no difference in his behavior. His world revolved around his drink.

DV007 (SCV): He will not speak till morning. He will abuse or beat till is under influence of alcohol. After the kick is gone, he is calm. He gets ready in the mornings, will have his tea and go to work. But in the evening, he will get drunk while coming back.

However, to say that the situation was devoid of any control would be false as well. Vinaya's husband continued to beat her to get money from her. The control that he exerted, while strictly instrumental, derived its power and authority from the larger patriarchal family structure that sanctions the use of violence against the wife.

With the case of Dhriti, the control tactics that are used in most intimate terrorist relationships are prevalent.

I: Can you tell me some reasons why your husband beats you?

DV014 (IT): Can't cook. Didn't wash clothes properly. If I refuse relationship [indicating refuse to have sex] then too, he beats me. I get so tired from 7 am to 3 pm. And I cannot tell you one particular reason.

“Why did you say no? Did you go to somebody’s house?” He asks me these questions and beats.

All the control tactics that intimate terrorists use in India such as locking up or out, threatening, being suspicious, withholding affection, monitoring movements, humiliating in front of others, verbal abuse, using children to control her life, deprivation, blaming, minimizing the violence, as well as material and emotional neglect were used systematically not only by the husband but also by the husband’s family against the woman. In addition, these tactics increased in frequency and intensity over a period of time.

Family characteristics

The influence of living arrangements and the addition of new members into the household played a critical role in the second incident of violence against Hasini. While Hasini was able to accept the first incident of violence without qualms, the second incident (also being recent) triggered feelings of resentment towards the extended family network. For example, when Hasini talked about the first incident, she was quite ready to accept that because she was not taking good care of her children, the violence was justified. It was also one of the ways in which she conceptualized her husband to be a good father, because he would not have taken that step if he didn’t love his children. In addition, she doesn’t seem to have conceptualized the first incident of violence as violent. The following is her statement from the second interview (after the second incident):

DV004 (SCV): He never behaved in such a bad manner before. Now we have been married for almost 10 years, but he never did something like this before.

Here, Hasini seems to have forgotten that he was violent before. However, after the second incident, she seemed angrier, took steps to hold on to that anger (she didn’t go back to the household until her daughter requested it), and also approached other individuals about it. This might have to do with the fact that the second assault was carried out in front

of a third party in the marital household. In addition, there were clear indications even from the husband that the violence would not have happened but for the presence of these additional family members.

DV004 (SCV): I am mad at them because they don't talk to me or behave normally with me'. He said, 'If they don't talk, then you talk to them'. Then I said, 'I don't need to. It was she who was mad at me due to that chapel episode. She should have told me'. Then he said, 'How can you say that you don't need to talk to them? I am her son. She is my mother. You have to stay with them. How can you say that you won't talk? That's why I beat you. No other reason'.

Thus, there seems to be some influence of family structure on the situational couple violence that Hasini experienced.

As for Vinaya, in the absence of the marital and natal household (both sets of parents had passed away), she became the head of the household. Because her husband was no longer earning and she was financially responsible for the running of the household, including managing her sons' income, she garnered a place of authority in the household. This position in the hierarchal family structure helped her enormously in gaining the support of her sons and neighbors in combating the violence..

DV007 (SCV): My sons cannot tolerate my husband's beating. So the sons do counterattack on him.

Other voice: It happens every day. Regularly, we need to intervene in these matters.

For Dhriti, the marital family household was a place of high control and violence. Even after her separation from the household, they continued to harass her by filing a suit towards her family for harassment. Thus, the family context was part of the extensive physical, verbal, and emotional abuse that Dhriti experienced during her marriage.

I: When you were getting beaten up, did anyone else intervene?

DV014 (IT): No. My mother-in-law never asked him to stop beating. Neither did my brother-in-law nor sister-in-law.

Not only was there no intervention on the part of the family to curtail the violence, there was active participation and instigation of violence. Like the resentment Hasini felt for the presence of her mother-in-law, Dhriti also felt that the extended marital family members should have no say in the marital relationship between husband and wife.

I: [Do you think you deserve the abuse that you received]? Do you think so?

DV014 (IT): No, it is wrong. Who is my brother-in-law? He is a stranger [from another's house]. Anyone other than my husband cannot beat me, it is wrong. I should have lodged a complaint at the time, and then I wouldn't have had to see this day.

In this case, Dhriti was not in agreement with the violence from her brother-in-law. Although she was skeptical that the violence from her husband had any concrete reason, Dhriti did not question the 'moral' authority and power that her husband had. She did, however, question the power and authority her marital family had over her.

The family context, through its impact on the marital relationship, has a significant effect on the ways women view and experience domestic violence. In addition, women seem to resent or push against this 'moral' authority that the larger family structure seems to have on their marital relationship and consequently, on the violence that they experience. At least two of the women (Hasini and Dhriti) seem to be making a distinction between public and private, so that the marital relationship, while being situated within the familial household, is separate from it.

Marital characteristics

The three women often mentioned ways in which they expected their husbands to be, and the distance between these expectations and reality. This often translated into how they perceived their marital quality and marital happiness. Hasini, as mentioned before, reported high marital happiness. But the happiness that was expressed was not unqualified.

I: How happy are you in this marriage?

DV004 (SCV): I am extremely happy and I will always be so because there is nothing to be unhappy about. I will always smile like this and I will be happy. Even if he beats me, still my anger will subside by the afternoon and I will keep on smiling.

These statements of happiness almost seem like a resolution on the part of Hasini, rather than a statement of fact. I would argue that this construction of happiness in the context of violence is very important to our understanding of the ways in which women experience violence in the marital relationship.

For example, in Vinaya's case, the happiness in the marriage is not related to the violence at all. Instead, she links happiness directly with her husband's drinking behaviors.

I: How far are you satisfied with your marriage?

DV007 (SCV): In the beginning, it was good, say for 10-15 years. We had 4 kids also. But after that my husband started drinking. So presently, our condition is far from good.

In informal conversations, she argued that the violence did not play a major role in her unhappiness, his alcoholism did. She told us that if her husband stopped drinking, she would be happy. Her construction of happiness, therefore, was formed in reference to the drinking behavior, not the violence. Unlike Hasini, Vinaya didn't hope that the happiness of her marriage could be salvaged in any way. She had given up on the behavior of her husband, and didn't anticipate any improvement in the quality of their marriage.

Surprisingly, Dhriti was hopeful that she could be happy again in the marital relationship if her husband returned to Pune and lived with her away from his natal family. She had some basis for this expectation, because the violence had been reduced for three years when they were living in Pune. In addition, she viewed the controlling nature of the marital household rather than her husband as the main hindrance to the quality of her marriage. At the same time, she was quite distraught about the kidnapping of her children.

Like Vinaya, she felt that she had done everything she could to improve the relationship, but that without the cooperation of her husband, the relationship was not likely to be salvaged.

I: What did you feel about your husband at that time?

DV014 (IT): I used to get really mad. I felt like killing him.

Still, unlike Vinaya, she was still hopeful that if her husband repented, there was a chance at happiness in the marriage.

Coping

Marital expectations also formed a big part in women's coping with the violence.

One of the ways to examine this is through marital communication right after the violence.

I: Now, did he beat you again?

DV004 (SCV): No. He says 'I am sorry I beat you....' He tries to pacify me and then this makes me happy.

In this case, the happiness to which Hasini refers is due to her husband's communication regarding the violence, and his repentance in the aftermath of the violence. The anger and betrayal that Hasini felt after the second incident was not only validated by the husband, but he also took active steps to woo her back by buying her gifts and helping her out in the house. This form of repentance from the husband is not evident in either of the other two cases. In the case of Vinaya, the violence was so routine that they didn't even address the consequences of the violence

I: When your husband beats you, what does he do after that?

DV007 (??): Nothing. He abuses verbally and sleeps.

Vinaya told us repeatedly that no effort to talk to her husband or any attempt at intervention had the slightest effect on her husband, and marital communication was restricted to the exchange of information about money or other household matters. Even these communications were not always fruitful and almost always led to fights or arguments. The

other forms of communication that her husband indulged in were “mutterings” when he was drunk.

This was definitely not the case with Dhriti. Marital communication between Dhriti and her husband in the aftermath of violence usually consisted of verbal assaults or accusations on the part of the husband. Even conversation around dinner seemed to be about her inabilities and incompetence.

Why does he beat directly? Why doesn't he tell you orally?

DV014 (SCV): He tells sometimes – if there are other people around. Once when I asked in front of guests, he told the truth. One day I literally brought the khichadi out and asked others to taste and see if there was excess salt. But it was really good. It was not too salty.

Uncle: We, too, tasted it. It was good.

Dhriti told us that she wanted to bring the food out for everyone to taste because she was tired of her husband telling her that she was a bad cook. She wanted to communicate to her husband and to others in the household that his reasons for harassing her were not valid. In this particular instance, Dhriti used the presence of others to confront her husband's accusations. As I mentioned before, there seems to be a public/private line within households that separates marital households from the others in joint families. Marital arguments are most likely considered to be a private matter, a fact that potentially helps many perpetrators of violence to assault their wives in the joint family household with minimal intervention.

By their own admission, Dhriti and Hasini do not like it when other members cross these lines. But in this particular instance, Dhriti, seems to have crossed it to make a point to her husband. She told us that she brought others into the argument in that instance because she did not want to accept all the blame for the relationship.

She also started confronting her husband about the reasons for the violence. In fact, we see that all women used some form of confrontational technique in response to violence. All of them felt they were not to be blamed for the violence. While Hasini felt that she could improve her behavior, Vinaya and Dhriti did not state that they needed to change their own behavior in order for their relationship to change. The confrontational techniques were met with varying results.

Hasini, for instance, was the only one of the three women whose confrontations led her husband to engage in conversations about the impact of violence. This was most likely because her husband was open to Hasini's suggestions and wanted to improve relations with her. But she, like the others, also had to walk a thin line to avoid repercussions.

DV004 (IT): I don't want to stay here. Should [her in-laws] dictate terms all the time? I cannot do according to my wishes, anytime? Don't I have any right?' Then he said, 'How can you talk like this? I buy gold for you, I do this for you'. Then he started beating me more.

In this instance, her confrontation was used as a reason to hit her. But after this second episode of violence, Hasini told us that the relationship had gone back to normal, and that she was able to speak her mind.

While this violent retaliation was uncharacteristic of Hasini's marital relationship, it was the norm in Dhriti's relationship. While most of the violence that Dhriti experienced was largely without reason, a few instances of violence had occurred because she had confronted her husband about his misbehavior. Even though the outcome of the confrontations was not very useful, Dhriti continued to confront him and occasionally used physical force to make her point.

Mother: But she has beaten him once when he was drunk.

DV014 (IT): Yes, even I have beaten him. Once when I was pregnant, he came home completely drunk and vomited in the house.

So I beat him saying that I have been waiting for you to come home so we can have dinner. But it was stinking terribly. So I beat him up.

But Dhriti realized in the course of the relationship that confrontation was rarely useful in decreasing the violence, and the receptivity of her husband to her arguments was minimal. This was true for Vinaya as well. As pointed out earlier, Vinaya rarely achieved any positive results from these confrontations.

However, these confrontational techniques were useful for all three women, although in different ways. For Hasini, they gave her a template for understanding the cause of the violence, and the ways to avoid it.

DV004 (SCV): I said the same thing to him. ‘This year, you beat me twice. Why did you do it? You could have explained it to me nicely’. He said, ‘No, Now you will not repeat the mistake. I have told you once that you should not talk. Now you will not speak again’....now that you are staying with your n-laws, and then you need to control yourself and not talk in front of them. And then how long are they going to be with us anyway?

The changed circumstances of their living situation and the demands on the marriage by the introduction of additional family members were cited as reasons by the husband, and through these reasons, the husband was able to convince Hasini that the violence was temporary in nature.

For Vinaya, the lack of response to her confrontation led her to take the primary responsibility for the household and earn her own livelihood.

Other Voice: What he offers you? Does he work in the household?

DV007 (SCV): There is no significant help....I do all the work.

In the case of Dhriti, confronting her husband helped her to understand the marital role that she was supposed to live up to. These familial and marital expectations were laid down clearly for Dhriti before, during, or after the violence. For example, one of the persistent themes in the interview with Dhriti was that her husband didn't like her to talk. In

fact, one of the criticisms leveled at her from her marital household was that she would talk openly to family members and other outsiders⁵.

DV014 (IT): The village people feel [her in-laws] are docile. I stand out because I talk openly. The whole village says that this woman talks...

Dhriti told us that she often persisted in defying the rules set down by her in-laws in the village and that she is now suffering the consequences for her defiance.

DV014 (IT): and once he went to the village, he said ‘I will beat you so terribly that your people won’t be able to recognize your face. It is what we do with the snake. Even if we kill a snake, we are not sure that it is dead and so we keep on beating it. That’s what I am going to do with you’. And I am afraid to go to the village for this reason.

Fear, along with sadness, anger, and helplessness were a few of the common emotions that all the three women shared.

Emotions

As mentioned before, Dhriti and Hasini were hopeful that the violence would end, but Dhriti was also skeptical about the chances that her husband would listen to her. Most of the helplessness that women felt was because of the limitations of their circumstances. For Vinaya, there was no one in the marital household or the natal household to whom she could go to.

I: How frequently you used to go there?

DV007 (SCV): I used to go often. I used to stay for 6 months or a year. Now, my parents as well as in-laws are no more. I have no support from any side. Where should I go?

Even when there was support within the relationship, as in the case of Hasini, we see that she is trying to work through her own conflicted feelings of helplessness and anger.

DV004 (SCV): I thought I would go to Vaishali Tai’s house and from there directly to my parent’s house. But how could I go alone at night?

⁵It didn’t come as a surprise that she was one of the few women in the study who was choked more than a few times in the relationship.

So I just calmed myself down. My husband had started looking for me by that time. Then I went home. Then he asked me, ‘Don’t you want to come inside?’ I said, ‘Yes, I want to’. Then he said, ‘Come on. I won’t beat you now. Go to sleep. Whatever you want to decide, decide in the morning’.

Even though this conversation was in the context of illustrating how understanding her husband really was, Hasini was also telling us that she had considered leaving him, at least temporarily. Dhriti was much more vocal about the different types of emotional responses that she had to her husband and to the violence.

I: What did you feel about your husband at that time?

DV014 (IT): I used to get really mad. I felt like killing him. Now I feel like ending everything. The day they took my children away, that day everything was over.

In fact, both Vinaya and Dhriti talked extensively about wanting to kill themselves when they were getting assaulted. Both of them said that family responsibilities were the reason that they continued to live in the relationship.

DV007 (SCV): My parents married me off. But now they are not alive now. Whom should I blame? I cannot go anywhere. So I am living here, though it is painful.

Even though all of the women report feeling lonely in the process of coping with violence, each of them had varying degrees of support from their familial and non-familial networks. For instance, Hasini had a supportive network of women who lived very close to her home. In addition, she lived close to the micro-credit union and therefore had easy access to all their resources, material and emotional. In fact, the first house that she wanted to run to was that of a caseworker in the organization. Through their support, she was able to get her husband to come to the organization for mediation. Although the husband was defensive during the meeting (I attended the meeting, but didn’t record it), he was also repentant.

Vinaya, as stated above, didn't have any natal familial support, but she did have physical, emotional and financial support from her sons, as well as help from informal networks (such as her neighbors). In the case of Dhriti, her entire natal family was very supportive of her. Her parents and her uncle always traveled with her to the houseworker's union where she was lodging her complaints. These forms of structural support cannot be underestimated. In fact, one of the primary commonalities of the three cases is that all three women were able to cope with the violence (and/or control) because of the support that they were able to garner from their families and informal networks.

Summary

The differences among the three cases are vast. They document the diversity of domestic violence in India. The comparisons across the cases illustrate the ways in which the characteristics of violence, such as the frequency or the severity, have a complicated relationship with patriarchal control context. For example, while Hasini did not experience the same severity of violence as the others, the violence reinforced specific gender and familial norms of the patriarchal family structure. In contrast, Vinaya experienced chronic violence from her alcoholic husband, but was able to function with relative freedom within and outside her household.

These analyses also illustrate that the dynamics of intimate terrorism in India are not very different from the dynamics of intimate terrorism in the U.S; it is only compounded by a complex family structure. For example, Dhriti was dealing not only with the control tactics that are typically used by intimate terrorists, but also with the control tactics used by the extended family.

In addition, these analyses illustrate that the joint family in India cannot be viewed as a single undifferentiated unit. It seems that there are public/private boundaries instituted

even within the joint family household. Both Hasini and Dhriti refer to this boundary when they examine the influence that the extended family network has on their marital relationship. In addition, women experiencing violence within these joint households seem to be fairly ambivalent about the role that the household plays in the violence. For example, both Hasini and Dhriti blamed the extended family for the violence. Yet, Hasini was able to garner the (reluctant) sympathy of her marital household, and her mother-in-law ministered to her injuries after the violence was over. In the case of Dhriti, she was able to cope with the violence because of the extensive support of her natal family members. In both cases, family systems functioned both in aiding and resisting violence.

These analyses also illustrate the active nature of all three women in coping with the violence. While the three women differed in terms of their use of coping strategies, they all seem to have a considerable variety of means by which to deal with their violent relationship. For example, although all of the women used compliance, leaving, and resistance behaviors to confront situational couple violence, alcohol-induced violence, and intimate terrorism, the manner in which they used them differed greatly. In addition, the results that they obtained from these coping behaviors differed greatly.

In conclusion, these cases illustrate the different ways in which control and violence interact, but also throw into sharp relief the complexity of this interaction. Simple lines among happiness, violence, marital quality, social role, coping, and controlling contexts cannot be drawn. They are related to each other in an interaction that is greatly influenced by interpersonal interactions and circumstances. Additionally, we see that women are not mere subjects of the violence or the control context, but are active agents in dealing with the consequences of violence and control.

The Philosophers: Lao-Tzu

“Those who speak know nothing:
Those who know are silent”
Those words, I am told,
Were spoken by Lao-tzu,
If we are to believe that Lao-tzu,
was himself one who knew,
How came it that he wrote a book
of five thousand words?

Po Chu

Chapter 8

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

One of the central objectives of feminist research is to uncover the hidden spaces of power and privilege that exist in gendered relationships (Enslin 1994). Through this interest, feminists have been able to identify gender discrimination in many areas of women's lives. Examinations of factors such as gender differentials in infant and child mortality and gender-based violence against adults contribute to our understanding of the gender dynamics in each society (Mohanty et al. 1991). In addition, women's lives can be examined through the lens of their everyday lives. Personal narratives of women have become central to feminist researchers, partly because women's life stories exhibit the richness of gendered relations and the processes by which women negotiate them (Enslin 1994).

This subjective experience of women is important primarily because gender is so pervasive an aspect of women's (and men's) lives that the exact effect of gendered relations can be hard to decipher. In taking a cue from these feminist scholars, I study women's lives by analyzing the relationships among patriarchal structure, domestic violence, and women's agency, in the gendered lives of Indian women.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The main questions of the research project are: (1) What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence? (2) How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives? (3) What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts? (4) How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts? In order to answer these questions, I used a blended methodology of qualitative and

quantitative methods using secondary data from the Demographic Health Survey, and primary data from three field sites in a city in India. With the help of these methodologies, I am able not only to assess the different characteristics of domestic violence and coping, but also to understand the complexities of their interaction.

(1) What are the different types of control that families exert over women in situations of domestic violence?

One of the major contributions of this research is that it documents, for the first time, the two different kinds of violence that are currently prevalent in the Indian families: situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. Additionally, I was able to document that there are qualitative differences in the way women experience these different forms of violence in their marital and familial relationships. The characteristics of intimate terrorism seem to translate very well across cultural contexts, as evidenced by the use of very similar control tactics by used by men in Indian and Western contexts.

The characteristics of women experiencing situational couple violence were more closely aligned with women experiencing no violence at all, than they were to those of women experiencing intimate terrorism. For example, we find that women experiencing situational couple violence report very similar levels of marital happiness as women experiencing no violence. Women experiencing intimate terrorism experience significantly lower levels of marital happiness. This finding also illustrates another important finding: Patriarchal control contexts have an additional impact on women's domestic lives that goes above and beyond the impact of physical violence. These analyses also expand the applicability of the typology to the joint family system. Previously, the typology was used primarily to examine the husband-wife dyad. In these analyses, however, we see that the

typology can be used to explain the larger control dynamics prevalent in the joint family system.

(2) How do the different contexts of domestic violence influence the strategies used by families to control women's economic and social lives?

In addition to documenting of the different types of violence, I found that the manner in which they interact with their contexts is characteristically different. The quantitative and qualitative data provide somewhat different insights into these differences. The quantitative data for the relationship between the experience of violence and the physical mobility and independence of women indicate that women who do not experience violence are not required to get permission to run errands or to socialize with friends. This is not true for women experiencing the two kinds of violence—they are required to get permission from their marital family members to do any of the aforementioned activities.

Looking at the qualitative narratives, we find that for women experiencing situational couple violence, the asking of permission is often a token gesture. There was evidence to suggest that husbands and family members rarely barred them from these activities when permission was asked. In contrast, for many women experiencing intimate terrorism, the lack of physical mobility or independence was quite real. In some instances, women were not allowed to step out of their homes. Thus, the generalized pattern of control exerted by the husband or the marital family has an impact on women experiencing intimate terrorism.

The socio-demographic variables such as education and labor force participation that are significant predictors for women in the national dataset were not that critical in the fieldwork analyses. However, it would be foolish to dismiss their impact. From the qualitative interviews, we find that women who retain control over their earnings have some resources to negotiate with, and their coping strategies do differ when they have monetary

resources of their own. For example, leaving was often contingent upon whether women could support their families after leaving. Their education and continued labor force participation often helped to make the decision to leave the relationship easier.

At the same time, labor force participation can often be the source of violence for women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. For example, Hasini was beaten for the first time after she decided to go to work on a farm to supplement the household income. For women experiencing intimate terrorism, movement outside the home when they went out for work was often closely monitored. These behaviors continued after women left the relationship to establish their own households. In one specific example, a woman separated from her household was stalked to and from her place of work. Thus, the relationship between labor force participation and the experience of violence was not unidirectional, and depending on the control context, it could be a negative or a positive factor in women's lives.

Another important finding related to the structural contexts of domestic violence is the use of alcohol by the husband. Husbands who were intimate terrorists were more likely to use violence when they were drunk. For many intimate terrorists, being drunk is used as an excuse to inflict high levels of violence against their wives. However, as the qualitative narratives suggest, this was not universally true. Many alcoholics in the sample did not try to control their wives as long as they had ready access to alcohol. Violence in these cases was used very instrumentally to fund their addiction. This does not mean that the violence was not chronic or severe; it just did not have any elements of generalized control.

This finding illustrates a critical aspect of the typology. While situational couple violence is not always characterized by chronic and severe violence, under the 'right' circumstances, it can be. The typology, remember, is NOT based on severity or even

frequency of violence, as has sometimes been assumed. Instead, it is based on the generalized patterns of control that families or more particularly, men wield on women.

In addition, we found that the structure of the family is quite influential in the way women experienced situational couple violence and intimate terrorism. Women experiencing intimate terrorism are more likely to have experienced highly controlling contexts from extended family members, and to have virtually no support from them during the violence. For women experiencing situational couple violence, most of the violence was restricted to the husband, and on many occasions, women were able to solicit help from the marital family to stop the violence. I also found that while there is some evidence that mother-in-laws harass their daughter-in-laws, the vilification of the former is not warranted, especially in the case of situational couple violence. On the contrary, in many instances of situational couple violence, and in some instances of intimate terrorism, mother-in-laws were the first source of help for women.

One of the more unanticipated findings in this research is the importance of social, familial, and marital roles that affect domestic violence in the household. For many women, especially in intimate terrorism, justifications for the violence hinged on their understanding and expectation of what a 'good' wife should be. Additionally, these role expectations were directed towards their husbands, to gauge whether their husband was a good husband. They often used these role expectations and the deviations from them by their husbands to garner support from their marital and familial households. Thus, while I found evidence that the patriarchal roles of a good wife often trap women in controlling contexts, these very social roles also help women cope with the violence.

(3) What are the different coping strategies that are used by women to deal with violence in these differing contexts?

In addition to the documentation of differences amongst the types of violence, I also found that women use different coping strategies to deal with violence. For example, in addition to the help-seeking, conciliatory, resistance, and leaving behaviors (that have already been documented in the U.S. and India), I found that negotiating and independent behaviors were used by women experiencing intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. Women experiencing situational couple violence did not use a wide range of coping strategies, probably because the violence was usually sporadic, and long-term coping was unnecessary. For women experiencing intimate terrorism, I found that most women used a wide range of tactics and they often employed them strategically, based on familial, cultural, and personal constraints.

(4) How are these coping strategies influenced by the interaction of particular cultural, social, and economic contexts?

Contrary to my expectations, women experiencing intimate terrorism are more likely to use resistance behaviors than women experiencing situational couple violence. Even with these high rates, I suspect that one of the reasons that resistance is not used more often by women who experience intimate terrorism is the fear of retaliation. In addition, women experiencing intimate terrorism rarely minimize the importance of domestic violence in their marital lives. Women were also active in seeking help from family members, relatives, and neighbors. Women experiencing situational couple violence also engage in these help-seeking behaviors but not as frequently or strategically as women experiencing intimate terrorism. Women's first resource when dealing with violence was the marital family, followed by natal family. Women also took the help of informal social networks such as friends and neighbors

to stop the violence in the short term or in the long term. These familial and social networks were often the foundation for any coping strategy that women employed. The wider range of coping behaviors used by women experiencing intimate terrorism compared to situational couple violence gives us an indication that the coping strategies are in response to control contexts, rather than to the violence per se.

One of the major factors that determined women's coping strategies is the financial and familial resources that women had. If women had one of the two resources (familial or financial), they were more likely to take proactive steps to either end the relationship or to end the violence within the relationship. All of these strategies were weighed against the particular social context. For example, rural women were not very likely to leave the marital relationship because their social networks are not usually supportive of unattached women.

Leaving and compliance behaviors were popular coping strategies, especially for women experiencing intimate terrorism. Leaving was not always a good option, because even when women exited the relationship, the violence and the accompanying control did not always end. For women who could not leave because of financial or familial restrictions, compliance was the next best alternative. Women who left the relationship usually approached the police or women's groups for help. Mediation or legal actions were the most frequently used techniques employed by these formal networks. Both of these actions had mixed results. While the former is probably a good technique for women experiencing situational couple violence, women experiencing intimate terrorism found that mediation was not very helpful. In addition, the paternalistic and patriarchal attitudes of the judicial system often dissuaded women from pursuing any legal action against their husbands. Despite these limitations, many women in my study pursued these options.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF RESEARCH

Patriarchal control and domestic violence

One of the prominent contributions of this research is that it addresses the complicated relationship between patriarchal control and domestic violence. In the Indian context, discussions of the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence have often been circular. However, with the discovery that domestic violence does not always stem from the immediate patriarchal control exerted by the husband, we can establish the following things.

Firstly, it is not enough to examine patriarchal structure as the only source for violence. Instead, domestic violence must also be examined with respect to other contexts, such as interpersonal relationships in the marital household, the influence of alcohol consumption, and influence of socio-demographic factors. Secondly, the dyad of husband-wife cannot be the only focus of research on domestic violence in India. The family context within which the marital couple is situated must be taken into consideration. The structure of the family and the division of power and authority amongst its members is often a critical aspect of domestic violence and coping. Thirdly, even while patriarchal structures and practices oppress women, they are also a source of 'liberation' from oppression for many women. Women are often able to combat the oppressive family structure through the strategic deployment of patriarchal social norms and social roles. Thus, instead of viewing patriarchy as a singular entity, we should start thinking about patriarchies that are influenced by familial and individual contexts that are reflected in its practice.

The idea that patriarchies have many forms is not a new idea, but this concept has rarely been applied to domestic violence in the Indian context. When examining the bulk of research, we find that apart from the depiction of the dominant male-protector-provider-

aggressor abusing a submissive-helpless-silent victim, the realities of the interaction among patriarchy, violence, and agency are rarely seen (Sangari 2002).⁶ Domestic violence is invariably seen as an endless system of systematic violence against a hapless woman. I do not dispute the severity and urgency of this claim. However, I contest that this is the *only* form and type of domestic violence that is present in India. In addition, I also contend that this depiction does not pay enough attention to the actions of women who cope with the violence. By fixing a “victim of patriarchy” status on Indian women, we are only capturing a partial picture of domestic violence in India, ignoring the socio-demographic, familial, marital, and personal contexts that equally influence women’s experience of violence.

Women’s agency and domestic violence

Another major contribution of this research is that it takes into consideration the interaction of agency and domestic violence. It is clear from these analyses that agency exercised by a woman is rarely independent of other factors. These acts of agency are often supported and based on the actions of her immediate family members, her friends, her neighbors, as well as her socioeconomic status, her labor force participation, and a plethora of such influences. Thus, grouping all coping strategies that women adopt to combat violence into a singular narrative of agency does them injustice. Instead of conceptualizing a survivor as a strong rebellious woman who is constantly fighting with patriarchy, I would argue that a survivor is most likely to be someone who accepts patriarchal norms *and* rejects them, depending on the context. Therefore, instead of examining coping strategies as discrete categories, we should start examining coping behaviors as a wide range of interactive elements that include women’s acceptance and rejection of patriarchal norms.

⁶ For exceptions, see Abraham (2002), Ashwini (2001), McLeer (1998), Mitra (1999), Poonacha & Pandey (1999), Purkayastha et al. (2003).

In addition, these coping behaviors come with specific costs that the women weigh to choose the most appropriate response. However, it must be stressed here that this weighing of choices is shaped by women's particular circumstances, and that these choices are not equally available to everyone. For example, when women stay in marriages, it is not because they have no options, but rather because they have no viable options.

The support network around women (including familial and financial) can sometimes increase the options, but that is not always the case. Education and labor force participation is often seen as the first step towards 'liberation'. However, the assumption that this is always the case ignores the fact that family ties tend to be very strong. Despite the liberating effects of education, social practices that are entrenched in family life adapt themselves to the changes that education brings. For example, many families educate their daughters, not necessarily to make them independent, but because they become more attractive in the marriage market.

Thus, there needs to be a distinction between women's capabilities and women's opportunities (Mehra, 1997). Women's opportunities might stem from the socio-psychological, economic, and familial structure and support. However, women's responses have to do with women's capabilities as much as the opportunities that they possess. Thus, just like the interaction between patriarchy and violence, the interaction between agency and consent (to patriarchal structure) must be recognized. Women function in the realm of constraint and autonomy, simultaneously.

Cross-cultural studies

One of the primary features of cross-cultural study is that it examines the dynamics of a social phenomenon (in this case, domestic violence) in a different cultural context. By examining the effects that a different culture has on a social phenomenon, it simultaneously

illustrates the differences and commonalities of a social phenomenon across different cultural, social, and economic contexts. By conducting this study in India, not only is the knowledge base about domestic violence and its relationship to patriarchal structure being expanded in India, but there is also a simultaneous expansion of knowledge about domestic violence in general, an expansion that will aid U.S. researchers who study the phenomenon.

For example, with reference to India, I am able to question the relationship between patriarchy and domestic violence that is usually taken for granted. With reference to the U.S., I am able to illustrate the importance of family context, the central role of alcohol, and the diversity of women's coping in understanding domestic violence in general. In addition, it is important to know that the mechanisms of intimate terrorism are very similar across these very different cultural milieus. This finding will help us narrow our focus of study to understanding the common traits present in both countries that seem to give rise to these common forms of control tactics. The typology has not really been applied in contexts other than Western countries, such as the U.S., the U.K., and Canada. Thus, expanding the typology to suit the cultural milieus of other countries would greatly increase our understanding of domestic violence. I would also argue for recognizing diversity within the Indian context. Too often, domestic violence in other countries has been associated with the 'culture' of those countries, without taking into consideration the intersectionality of race, class, gender, religion, and ethnicity. So, the similarity of domestic violence across cultural contexts should also be examined in order to understand the influence of 'culture' on the manifestation of domestic violence.

LIMITATIONS

The limitations of this study arise primarily from the methodology and data used in the study. I have used secondary data in this study to examine the larger context within

which domestic violence takes place. However, the absence of control or coping measures make for only a partial analysis of this larger context. In order to fully understand the relationship between patriarchal control and domestic violence in India, I need information on control contexts on a national level. Because intimate terrorism and situational couple violence cannot be delineated in the secondary data, I do not have the means of understanding the influence of socio-demographic characteristics on the different types of domestic violence.

As with qualitative data based on convenience sampling, one of the limitations with this dissertation is the lack of generalizability. The data come from a self-selected sample of 80 women. While the sample is fairly large for a qualitative study, the results cannot be generalized to any identifiable population. As with all convenience samples, women who selected themselves into this sample probably differ in some unique ways from women who did not participate in our study. For example, given that women were contacted with the help of organizations that dealt with cases of domestic violence, women experiencing intimate terrorism were more likely to be selected for the study. Additionally, women who proactively engaged with the violence were also more likely to be selected given that they were seeking help from the organizations.

In addition, the sample did not have a lot of variability in terms of class and caste. Because I worked with organizations that catered to lower-class and generally lower-caste women, these analyses is not translatable or transferable to other socioeconomic or even other cultural contexts. For example, women that I interviewed were likely to be quite different from their counterparts in other parts of the country such as Bihar or Kerala. Since women in the family in these other states are treated quite differently, conclusions based on this sample may not be equally applicable in other contexts. However, given that the purpose

of the sample was to identify mechanisms and processes, and not necessarily generalizability of these processes, the information obtained from the data was useful in answering the research questions.

One of the drawbacks of the study is that it does not have information from the husband regarding marriage and domestic violence. Although I do have some limited information from the wives about their husbands' earning capabilities, labor force participation, contribution to the household, and the reasons given for the violence, my study would have been greatly enhanced if the perspective of the husband had also been obtained. This is especially relevant to our understanding of situational couple violence, because the violence stems primarily from interpersonal dynamics, rather than a patriarchal structure. One of the primary reasons for the lack of these data is that most husbands are unwilling to talk to others (especially a woman) about their marital life or about the violence they perpetrate. Also, given the limited time and resources that I had at my disposal, having separate interviews with husbands was not feasible and/or ethical, considering the physical and emotional risks to the participants.

A primary limitation of my study is that it does not take into consideration the control dynamics of the entire family. Because I have evidence, especially in the qualitative analysis, that the joint family system is implicated in the women's experiences of patriarchal control, it would have been useful to assess the specific control tactics of individual members of the joint family. This information about the control tactics used by the entire family would have contributed greatly to the analysis because it would have given us more insight into the dynamics of the joint households and the ways in which power and control are exerted or negotiated.

Another limitation of the study is that the time spent with respondents from each of the sample sites was different. Women in Somatne had to travel at least an hour to come to an interview and that proved to be a disincentive for second interviews. Women in the Corporation sample rarely agreed to a second interview because they also traveled great distances to come to the organization. Therefore, when they came to the organization, they (understandably) wanted to spend more time with the caseworkers instead of talking to us. The Pimpri office was located in close proximity to the slum that it serviced, so most of the women in Pimpri were able to schedule and attend second interviews. Thus, although I got first interviews with all of the women in the sample, the detailed information about the control tactics were most likely to have come from the Pimpri sample. Therefore, the qualitative data were unevenly distributed.

Despite these limitations of the study, the data and methods used in the study have contributed greatly to our understanding of domestic violence. The information about the relationships among patriarchal structures, domestic violence, and agency is relevant not only to the scholarly community, but also to activists who work with survivors of domestic violence in India.

RELEVANCE OF RESEARCH

Relevance to theory

Feminist theory has been grappling with the construction of “woman” in the new global markets (Alcoff 1997, Chancer 1993, Flax 1990, McLaughlin 2004, McLeer 1998, Ong 1987). Given the influx of micro-credit unions and small industries that cater exclusively to women, economists and feminists alike have been exploring the implications and effects of these markets on the lives of women in India (Arora 1999, Grewal 1998, Mehra 1997, Mencher 1989, Moghadam 2000). In this larger context, the effects of global markets on the

Indian family structure, and consequently on the lives of Indian women need to be examined in greater detail. Although there has been greater participation of women in the work force, it is still unclear whether this economic power has helped women to be 'liberated' from patriarchal family structures (Menjivar & Salcido 2002). In fact, there is some evidence to indicate that there has been a backlash against women in the private sphere in response to their increased participation in the public sphere (Hemmet 2004, Kempadoo 1998, Menjivar & Salcido 2002)

Thus, it becomes critical to understand the mechanisms of patriarchy that function within the household, so that the 'liberation' of women from and within these patriarchal structures can be better understood. Given the interaction between global markets and the patriarchal household, it becomes imperative to unpack the processes and mechanisms through which the larger economic and patriarchal structures influence women's and men's actions within the household.

In addition, although developing social theory across countries, political boundaries, and socio-cultural contexts is a highly complicated project (Narayan 1997a), the benefits of such projects are indispensable. In this specific case, the development of an adequate theory of domestic violence requires that we understand the different ways in which patriarchal control and violence affect different families in different contexts, so that a more complete picture regarding domestic violence can emerge. For example, without the recognition that violence does not *necessarily* indicate the presence of patriarchal control, or that women are often exerting their agency by staying, we will not be able to develop adequate theories about the role that violence plays in intimate relationships or to create policies that will facilitate real change in women's lives.

Relevance to research

Because any study of domestic violence is dependent on cultural norms regarding family violence (D'Cruz & Bharat 2001, Dasgupta & Warriar 1996, Datar 1993, Elizabeth 2000), the cultural, social, and individual context from which the violence arises is particularly important. Although the social context constrains women in a variety of ways and imposes consequences for their choices, women are active in making decisions within these social, economic, and cultural constraints. Research on domestic violence should, therefore, pay attention to the experiences of victims who are actively involved in, reacting to, and coping with various types of domestic violence and/or controlling relationships (Naples 2003).

Thus, the study of domestic violence must incorporate the methodology of ethnography in addition to quantitative approaches to help us understand the experiences of individual women (Gorelick 1991, Visweswaran 1994). In this particular instance, this blended methodology gave me tools to evaluate the lived experiences of families facing different types of domestic violence, including the differential consequences of domestic violence for the health of women. The combination of methods also gave me theoretical insights into the mechanisms of patriarchy and domestic violence as they are experienced in Indian families. This combination is essential to differentiate among the variety of control contexts in which domestic violence takes place. In summation, this methodology gives us concrete data to evaluate the lived experiences of Indian families facing domestic violence.

Relevance to activists

It is important to understand the interpersonal dynamics involved in the different types of domestic violence in order to develop adequate interventions by the social, legal, and research community: "A community response...is shaped by a particular understanding

of what constitutes domestic violence...” (Duvvury et al. 2004). Based on my experience as a researcher and activist in the field of domestic violence, I would contend that community strategies of intervention could be severely handicapped if women experiencing different types of domestic violence are given uniform services that cannot adequately meet their needs. When counselors or social service agencies differentiate among the types of domestic violence and pay close attention to the cultural contexts of the women, they will be better able to help women make their *own* informed decisions about what they need to do to cope with their particular domestic violence situation. These distinctions would improve policy and intervention strategies for women who face domestic violence (Bush 1992).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Theory

Women’s place in the global market has become a prominent theme in feminist research and theory. In the new global economy, through small-scale and large scale endeavors (like Grameen bank), empowerment models have been put in place to facilitate women’s escape from the confines of patriarchal structure. Their increased economic independence is usually tied to the ‘liberation’ of women (Arora 1999, Grewal 1998, Mehra 1997, Mencher 1989, Moghadam 2000). While this is an excellent objective, it has the unintended consequence of assigning most of the responsibility for development and the household on the shoulders of women (Grewal 1998, Moghadam 2000). Women, thus, are sometimes unfairly burdened not only by the demands of the family, but also of work.

Simultaneously, this additional burden often undermines the authority and the role of men (as economic providers) in the household and in the family (Macmillan & Gartner 1999, Mencher 1989). Therefore, women are put in the uncomfortable position of reconciling their commitment to their local patriarchal family and their commitment to the

global burgeoning work force. While women's welfare programs and other NGOs working in the field have been directing their changes to issues of empowerment, equality, and justice (Mehra 1997), it must be recognized explicitly and implicitly that these ideals are often antithetical to the belief systems of women themselves (Moghadam 2000).

In order to study domestic violence in this global context, we must take into consideration that that even if domestic violence is universal (or global), it is also fluid, and rapidly adapting, subject to change and transformation depending on the specific cultural, familial and interpersonal contexts (or local). For example, while women are subject to strict patriarchal norms that serve to control them, they in turn use these patriarchal norms to increase their power and authority in the household. Sometimes it is through the reproduction of children (most specifically, sons) that they can ensure a rapid ascension in the hierarchical family structure.

While bearing sons may seem to be a reasonable solution to the oppression individual women feel within their family, some feminists argue, quite rightly, that these tools of the master can hardly dismantle the house (Lorde 1984). That is, by consenting to patriarchal structure and gaining power and authority through that structure, women are not necessarily gaining liberation from it. They are in fact reinforcing their own oppression. It would be a mistake to consider patriarchy an institution that can be redeemed simply by creating spaces within which its excesses are curtailed. The very practices through patriarchal structure that seem to offer women "freedom" may have the potential of entrapping them. In addition, it must be noted that these spaces of resistance to patriarchal structures and norms are often only available to a select few, who are privileged by other forms of domination such as religion, caste, or class.

Given that catering to patriarchal ideologies does not eliminate inequities or inequalities, close attention must be paid to the ways in which women use these master's tools, so that a careful analysis of consent and resistance to oppressive structures can be made. If we treat patriarchy as an unchanging ideology, then we cannot reconcile its implementation to the varying degrees of agency and consent that are bestowed upon women under its auspices. For example, if we assume that women are being oppressed by patriarchal structure, then we are neglecting the reality that women in patriarchal families do not have a singular identity of 'woman', but multiple relational identities that shift depending on temporal context (Sangari 2002). Thus, we must shift our focus of analysis of patriarchy as a concept beyond a specific ideological narrative to the understanding of multiple patriarchies that are formed in interaction with the relational identities of men and women. By examining this interaction, one can then begin to understand the interplay between patriarchal structure and women's agency in response to these structures.

Research

Most research in the domestic violence field has focused on men's actions, as reported by their female partners. This is partly due to the relatively easy accessibility of women as research subjects. Because men are not likely to volunteer information about their use of domestic violence, researchers have obtained information about the dynamics of domestic violence primarily from women. But as other scholars have pointed out, domestic violence is about men (Ahmed-Ghosh 2004, Holtzworth-Munroe et al. 1997, Holtzworth-Munroe et al. 2000). Thus, while we need to examine domestic violence that influences women's lives, we must also re-scrutinize men's role and responsibility in perpetrating domestic violence. Although I have been guilty of focusing only on women's experiences, I would argue that without men's perspectives and motives for the violence, the analysis of

domestic violence is incomplete. For example, it would be useful to know from the husband's standpoint, especially in situational couple violence, why violence was used in some instances of disagreement and not others. Without understanding the motives for domestic violence, as well as the costs and benefits to individual men who do use violence, we cannot understand the phenomenon of domestic violence.

In addition to focusing on men's actions and motives, we must broaden our focus from the woman's experience to the larger family context. Even in highly nucleated households, this focus on the larger family context can help de-emphasize the focus on women's action and help us in gaining a deeper understanding of the interpersonal nature of domestic violence that may or may not include dynamics of power and control. I would also argue that by shifting our focus to men's actions and to the larger family structure, we could place the primary responsibility for domestic violence on the man and the patriarchal structure that unfairly advantages him over the woman.

Another way to re-examine domestic violence is through the social roles of men and women in the family, and to scrutinize the purpose that these roles serve in the family structure. I believe by examining women's and men's narratives of their social roles, we can get closer to understanding the internal dynamics of family life, and thereby, to the processes and mechanisms of patriarchies. In addition, closer attention must be paid to relationships that do not report violence, in order to delineate the different ways in which control can be established or negotiated between the two marital partners without the use of violence.

One of the ways to do this would be to examine the emotional landscape of families. I would argue that research on domestic violence must examine the emotional responses of women to domestic violence. It seems that while the empowerment literature quite rightly focuses on making women independent of the constraints of the family and advocates an

increase in the physical and economic mobility of women, it leaves out a crucial part of women's response to domestic violence – the emotional one. Therefore, in-depth research on the emotional responses of men and women in domestic violence could give us greater insight into the marital relationship and the mechanics of domestic violence.

In addition, diversity of family forms in India and in the United States must be recognized. For example, given the diversity of family forms in immigrant communities in the United States, it might be useful to expand our understanding of domestic violence beyond the husband-wife dyad. Furthermore, in any community, there is a wide variation of men's control over women. As evidenced by this research, women who were not experiencing any violence told us that their husbands were quite supportive of their physical, emotional, and structural autonomy.

Activists

Community strategies to combat all forms of domestic violence have historically included mediation and legal action. In recent times, the criminalization of domestic violence, reduction of bureaucracy in the legal process, and sensitization of police to the issues of domestic violence has ensured some protection for women seeking help. In fact, these initiatives are critical for ensuring that women get justice. However, exclusively devoting our energies to mediation and legal action can be short-sighted. While they help alleviate women's experience of violence, they do not address the fundamental problem of inequality in the marital relationship. Even for women who are experiencing situational couple violence and are not being heavily controlled by their household or husband, we must pay close attention to the interpersonal dynamics that give rise to the use of violence.

This can be accomplished through the measures of mediation already put in place. The organizations that I worked with use mediation as a starting point to end disputes. They

bring families together and try to draw up informal contracts that often settle minor and major disputes. Therefore, the structures to improve women's lives are already in place. However, the emphasis of the discussion during the mediation needs to shift. Currently, mediation, while addressing the interpersonal element of the problem, emphasizes the needs of the family as a whole in coming up with solutions (Press 1992) This is, in fact, one of the better ways of conducting mediation, as it addresses the larger context of marital relationships. At the same time, this emphasis on the needs of the family rather than the needs of the wife reinforces the patriarchal structure by privileging the needs of the family over those of the woman. A balance between these (sometimes) conflicting needs must be struck.

Additionally, power relationships that are based on class and caste must be paid close attention to. Usually, the person presiding over the mediation session is someone with power over the wife and husband. While this might ensure that both parties listen to the mediator during sessions, it might translate very differently in their households. Therefore, power differentials in these mediation sessions must be taken into consideration, so that the solutions to the problems are not coming from the mediators, but from the individuals themselves. While it is possible that men and women are not always able to state or come up with their own solutions, the emphasis must not be on providing them with solutions, but helping them to come up with their own. Giving women the opportunity to state their needs in this safe space might help them to negotiate relationships that are more equitable in the privacy of their homes.

For women who are experiencing intimate terrorism, structures that foster independence from both the natal family and the marital home must be entertained. The most common reasons that women experiencing intimate terrorism state for returning to

their husbands are: (1) the husbands asked them to return, and (2) their natal families could not support them. This is one of the primary ways in which formal institutions can and should help. Most of the women who want to leave the relationship have nowhere to go. In addition, if they are living alone, they are subject to continued harassment not only from their husbands but also from other individuals in the community.

Transitional housing or transitional jobs are critical to ensure that women attain some independence and are able to support their families. Therefore, a systematic network of shelters that will give women respite, comfort and support, even if it is in the short term will be very useful for women. In addition, contact with women who are going through similar experiences might help to assuage some of the guilt and shame that women experience when making the decision to leave.

However, given that women's organizations and the government are working with very limited funding, transitional housing and jobs are not the most feasible solutions. What women's organizations can potentially do is set up set up informal networks of women who come together to exchange information about their lives and their experiences. Women in our interviews who were experiencing intimate terrorism often pointed out that more than the legal help that the organization was providing, women were grateful for the community of women who had shared similar experiences. Even for women who were interviewed by us for the first time, three of them commented that just talking about the violence helped them, even though we were unable to provide them with any formal assistance.

Most of the counselors in the organizations I was working with were more likely to talk to women about the practical aspects of living apart from the husband as opposed to the emotional aspects of living apart from the husband. This practical advice on managing money, job searches, and legal matters is extremely useful for women experiencing intimate

terrorism who have left their marital homes. However, many women are reluctant to leave for both practical and emotional reasons. Therefore, creating a safe space for women to converse might be useful so that women can make safe and healthy choices for themselves and their families. This might be especially useful for women experiencing intimate terrorism who feel isolated. I recognize that these social networks are not likely to be very useful for women who are closely monitored and their movements restricted. However, the presence of these networks or safe spaces might encourage women in these restricted environments to reach out to at least one other person.

Because informal networks are the primary sources of help for women in trouble, these small social networks that come together might be able to help women (who are experiencing situational couple violence and intimate terrorism) form their own solutions without having to worry about the social stigma of approaching a formal institution. Additionally, these social networks should be given some form of independence from the organization. The provision of just a physical space in which women can come and talk about various issues in their lives can be useful.

There are of course drawbacks to the formation of even these social groups. This safe space can easily be another way in which patriarchal viewpoints are reinforced, especially if the other women in the network endorse domestic violence. For example, I found that many of the caseworkers that women encountered did endorse domestic violence in certain cases. It led me to believe that when women go outside of their homes, the voices that they encounter are similar to their own. These women are probably being told to modify their own behavior to decrease the violence. This is extremely dangerous, precisely because it reinforces the justifications from the marital household and the husband. Therefore, ideally,

an attitudinal shift in organizations catering to women's needs (not just domestic violence centers) must be in place.

Given that the formal and informal networks that provide help to survivors of domestic abuse are not free from the socializing forces that endorse a limited amount of violence against the woman, we must move from directing our efforts to changing women's responses to recreating men's roles in the marriage. So, for example, instead of asking women to be more assertive or more compliant, we must focus on men's actions and start to re-examine or reinforce alternative versions of the responsibilities of men in marriage. I would argue that given that women in the privacy of their own homes have been using patriarchal discourses about the marital roles and responsibilities of husbands to reduce violence, we must also attempt to duplicate this process in the public realm. Instead of vilifying all men and men's actions, we must create spaces in the public discourse for violent men to reconceptualize masculinity within the patriarchal tradition.

While this sounds very good in theory, the actual implementation of examining men's responsibilities can be very difficult. It is hard to delineate the cultural and social upbringing that women and men experience right from the time that they are born. So, there needs to be a more flexible understanding of the context under which women achieve and establish a sense of empowerment within the structures of the family. To disown the family completely is not always an option. Nevertheless, the issue of domestic violence is often rooted within patriarchal familial hierarchies, and solutions lie in questioning and reformulating these hierarchical gender relationships (Ahmed-Ghosh 2004).

Thus, I would argue that our efforts must focus on men's behaviors and community attitudes about the duties and responsibilities of individual members in the patriarchal family structure. This is especially important because women are most likely to encounter these

community attitudes when they seek help. Educating women about their rights can yield no results if we continue to pretend that the emotional and psychological life of women is not affected by the culturally acceptable messages that permeate the social environment of men and women.

These modifications of the patriarchal discourse can happen through mediation, in women's groups, and in formal institutions. But more importantly, this should happen in the larger cultural discourse about patriarchy. One of the ways in which this can be accomplished is through elementary education. I believe one of the primary ways in which we can shift the blame for domestic violence from the woman to the man is through elementary school curricula, so that children have at least one alternative source of information that does not reinforce the larger patriarchal narrative of victim blaming.

The distribution of the alternate discourse must start young because the socializing forces of patriarchy also start young. For example, regardless of women's education and labor force participation, women's role expectations vis-à-vis the home have changed very little. Therefore, emphasis on gender education, i.e., information and techniques through which boys and girls can come to understand the importance of living more equitable lives can help create an attitudinal shift in the larger discourse. This, too, is difficult to achieve, given that educational institutions are not immune to the normative forces that pervade every other social institution. However, small efforts should be made in this direction. Without addressing issues of power in the household, placing responsibility on men's shoulders for the violence, and creating attitudinal shifts in the larger discourse, we cannot be successful in our efforts to end violence against women.

CONCLUSIONS

“Patriarchy” is an important conceptual tool for understanding women in India. Patriarchal structures often serve an important function in channeling women’s action and energies, even as they dominate and exploit these actions and energies. Women in India have been historically and inexorably linked to a social order that ensures that the members in the household are cared for by women in the family with great efficiency, usually by the mechanisms “devotion, silence, subjugation, and tolerance, even at the expense of glorifying such oppression through religion and mythology...”(Ahmed-Ghosh 2004). While the centrality of this claim is not disputed in this research project, I would argue that, in the context of domestic violence, viewing patriarchy only in this light refuses any agency to the women who participate, negotiate, and resist this system. The lived experiences of women within patriarchal family structures are far ranging and diverse.

They defy any succinct generalizations. For example, the notion of Indian women being oppressed by the Indian family structure is widely acknowledged (Narayan 1997b, Sangari 2002). However, in my own research, I found that while I did encounter women who fit this popular description, I also found women who did not.

DV023: I will tell you my own thought. I have guts to do whatever I can for my family. I will not let anything fall short for my son and my husband.

At the same time, the oppressive elements of the patriarchal family structure should not be de-emphasized. One of the primary concerns of any feminist research is to walk the thin line between representing women as hapless victims to oppressive structures and representing them as fearless heroines who are in charge of their own destiny. Because feminists are, by definition, concerned with changing the status quo that devalues and misrepresents women, emphasizing the narrative of hapless victim over the narrative of

fearless heroine (or vice versa) benefits neither the women nor the objective of the research. Thus, the manner in which oppression is articulated becomes critical in understanding the social reality of oppressed groups, in this case, women experiencing violence. In turn, this articulation can afford a means for women to resist their oppression (Thompson 1992). For example, at the end of her second interview, DV070 refused the compensation money that we offered her. When we asked her why, she gave us the following explanation.

DV070: Even I got something out of this, so I do not want any money for it. I thought about [the interview] very hard. I know what I experienced. only I know what I have faced. If I had behaved like others, I wouldn't have been alive. Or I would have adopted some 'other' ways of earning because I needed money... But I am aware of how my mother brought me up and under what kind of circumstances. [After the interview] I felt disillusioned with him that I don't have the slightest desire to go back to him. Even if he says that he is ready to give me Rs. 2,000,000 and asks me to go back to him, I won't be tempted by his offer. I didn't want money, gold or silver from him. All I wanted was loving and caring husband. He couldn't give that to me. One doesn't need money for this. But this man couldn't give me that.

This narrative illustrates two things: (1) the research process in and of itself can be conceptualized as a site through which social change (even minor shifts) can take place, and (2) women are not passive recipients of patriarchal ideologies. Instead, they are active participants in a dialogue that helps them to conceptualize and engage with patriarchal ideologies and domestic violence.

In conceptualizing, conducting, and writing about this research project, I emphasize that any study of patriarchal structure and domestic violence must take into consideration the interactive nature of patriarchal structure, domestic violence, and agency. Thus, we cannot examine patriarchy, domestic violence or agency as separate entities; instead, they must be examined in the ways in which they are reproduced in a set of social relationships. Only by doing so, can we hope to capture the strength, the vulnerability, and the courage that mark the lives of Indian women.

MULLIGATAWNY DREAMS

*anaconda. candy. cash. catamaran.
cheroot. coolie. corundum. curry.
ginger. mango. mulligatawny.
patchouli. poppadom. rice.
tatty. teak. vetiver.*

i dream of an english
full of the words of my language.

an english in small letters
an english that shall tire a white man's tongue
an english where small children practice with smooth round
pebbles in their mouth to the spell the right zha
an english where a pregnant woman is simply stomach-child-lady
an english where the magic of black eyes and brown bodies
replaces the glamour of eyes in dishwater blue shades and
the airbrush romance of pink white cherry blossom skins
an english where love means only the strange frenzy between a
man and his beloved, not between him and his car
an english without the privacy of its many rooms
an english with suffixes for respect
an english with more than thirty six words to call the sea
an english that doesn't belittle brown or black men and women
an english of tasting with five fingers
an english of talking love with eyes alone

and i dream of an english

where men
of that spiky, crunchy tongue
buy flower-garlands of jasmine
to take home to their coy wives
for the silent demand of a night of wordless whispered love . . .

Meena Kandaswamy

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Margaret. 1995. "Ethnicity, Gender, and Marital Violence: South Asian Women's Organizations in the United States." *Gender and Society* 9(4):450-468.
- . 1999. "Sexual Abuse in South Asian Immigrant Marriages." *Violence Against Women* 5(6):591-618.
- . 2002. "Addressing Domestic Violence and the South Asian Community in the United States." in *Contemporary Asian American Communities* ;, edited by Linda Trinh Vo, and Rick Bonus. Temple University Press.
- Abraham, Taisha. 2002. "Women and the Politics of Violence: Articulations and Re-Articulations." Pp. 1-11 in *Women and the Politics of Violence*, edited by Taisha Abraham. Shakti Books.
- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1990. "The Romance of Resistance : Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women." *American Ethnologist* 17(1):41-55.
- Afshar, Haleh. 1994. "Muslim Women in West Yorkshire : Growing up with Real and Imaginary Values amidst Conflicting Views of Self and Society." in *The Dynamics of 'Race' and Gender: Some Feminist Interventions*, edited by Haleh Afshar, and Mary Maynard. Taylor & Francis.
- Agnes, Flavia. 1990. "Wife Beating: Changes in Social Structure Crucial to Combat the Problem." Pp. 57-70 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sood Sushma. Arihant Publishers.
- . 1993. "The Anti-Rape Campaign." Pp. 99-150 in *The Struggle Against Violence*, edited by Chhaya Datar. Stree.
- Ahmad, Farah, Sarah Riaz, Paula Barata, and Donna E. Stewart. 2004. "Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women." *Violence Against Women* 10(3):262-282.
- Ahmed-Ghosh, Huma. 2004. "Chattels of Society: Domestic Violence in India." *Violence Against Women* 10(1):94-118.
- Alcoff, Linda. 1991. "The Problem of Speaking for Others." *Cultural Critique* 4:5-29.
- . 1997. "Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism : the identity crisis in feminist theory." in *The Second Wave: A reader in feminist theory*, edited by Linda J. Nicholson. Routledge.
- Allen, Katherine, and David H. Demo. 1995. "Families of lesbians and gay men: A few frontier in family research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57:111-127.
- Allen, Katherine, and Alexis Walker. 2000. "Constructing gender in families." in *Families as Relationships*, edited by Robert Milardo, and Steve Duck. Wiley.
- Almeida, Rhea V., and Ken Dolan-Delvecchio. 1999. "Addressing Culture in Batterers Intervention : The Asian Indian Community as an Illustrative Example." *Violence Against Women* 5(6):654-683.
- Anderson, K. L. 1997. "Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 59(3):655-669.
- Archer, J. 2000. "Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):651-680.

- Arendell, Terry. 2000. "Conceiving and investigating motherhood: The decade's scholarship." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:1192-1207.
- Arora, Balwinder. 1999. "Indian Women, Work and Participation." in *Gender Justice in India*, edited by Jag Mohan Singh Verma. Spellbound Publications.
- Atkinson, P., A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, and L. Lofland. 2001. "The handbook of ethnography." Sage Publications.
- Aziz, K. M. A. 1989. "Gender Creation from Birth to Adolescence in Rural Bangladesh." Pp. 55-74 in *Gender and the Household Domain*, edited by Leela Dube. Sage Publications.
- . 1989. *Gender Creation from Birth to Adolescence in Rural Bangladesh*. Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
- Bachman, R. , and D. Carmody. 1994. "Fighting with fire: The effects of victim resistance in intimate versus stranger perpetuated assaults against females." *Journal of Family Violence* 9(4):317-331.
- Bahr, Howard, and Kathleen Bahr. 1996. "A paradigm of family transcendence." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58:541-555.
- Banerjee, Upala Devi. 2004. "Globalization, Crisis in Livelihoods, Migration and Trafficking of Women and Girls: The Crisis in India, Nepal, and Bangladesh."
- Barnett, Ola W., Tomas E. Martinez, and Brendon W. Blustein. 1995. "Jealousy and Romantic Attachment in Maritally Violent and Nonviolent Men." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 10(4):473-486.
- Basu, Amrita, and Elizabeth McGrory. 1995. *The Challenge of local feminisms: women's movements in a global perspective*. Westview Press.
- Berg, B.L. 1995. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Allyn and Bacon Publications.
- Bernard, M.L., and J.L. Bernard. 1983. "Violent Intimacy : The Family as a Model for Love Relationships." *Family Relations* 32(2):283-286.
- Berscheid, Ellen, and Bruce Campbell. 1981. "The changing longevity of heterosexual close relationships: A commentary and forecast." in *The Justice Motive in Social Behavior*, edited by M.J. Lerner, and S.C. Lerner. Plenum.
- Bhatti, Ranbir Singh. 1990. "Socio-cultural Dynamics of Wife Battery." Pp. 45-56 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arahant Publishers.
- Billson, Mancini. 1991. "Towards a Feminist Methodology for Studying women Cross-culturally." *Women's Studies International Forum* 14(3):201-205.
- Birke, Lynda. 2000. "Sitting on the fence: Biology, feminism, and gender-bending environments." *Women's Studies International Forum* 23(5):587-599.
- Blake, Debra J. 1998. "Reading Dynamics of Power through Mexican-Origin Women's Oral Histories." *Frontiers* 19(3):24-41.
- Bloch, F., and V. Rao. 1997. "Error as a bargaining instrument: A case- study of dowry violence in rural India." Brown University.
- Blume, L. B. , and T. W. Blume. 2003. "Toward a dialectical model of family gender discourse: Body, identity, and sexuality." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(4):785-794.
- Blumstein, Phillip, and Peter Kollock. 1989. "Personal Relationships." Pp. 467-490 in *Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 14*, edited by W. Richard Scott. Annual Reviews.
- Booth, Karen M. 1998. "National mother, global whore, and transnational femocrats: The politics of AIDS and the construction of women at the World Health Organization." *Feminist Studies* 24(1):115.
- Borochowitz, Dalit Yassour, and Zvi Eisikovits. 2002. "To Love Violently : Strategies for Reconciling Love and Violence." *Violence Against Women* 8(4):476-494.

- Brace, Laura, and Julia O'Connell Davidson. 2000. "Minding the Gap: General and Substantive Theorizing on Power and Exploitation." *Signs* 25(4):1045-1050.
- Bradbury, T. N. 2002. "Invited program review: Research on relationships as a prelude to action." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 19(5):571-599.
- Britton, Dana. 2000. "Feminism in criminology: Engendering the law." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571:57-76.
- Bush, Diane Mitsch. 1992. "Women's Movements and State Policy Reform Aimed at Domestic Violence Against Women : A Comparison of the Consequences of Movement Mobilization in the U.S. and India." *Gender and Society* 6(4):587-608.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. Routledge.
- Campbell, J. C. , L. Rose, J. Kub, and D. Nedd. 1998. "Voices of strength and resistance: A contextual and longitudinal analysis of women's responses to battering." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13(6):743-762.
- Cancian, Francesca M. 1992. "Feminist Science: Methodologies that challenge Inequality." *Gender and Society* 6(4):623-642.
- Carlacio, Jami. 1998. "Resisting and Negotiating : Gender Roles and Rules in Patriarchy." *Feminist Collections* 29(2):3-6.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 1992. "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History : Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?" *Representations* 37:1-26.
- Chancer, Lynn Sharon. 1993. "Prostitution, Feminist Theory, and Ambivalence: Notes from the Sociological Underground." *Social Text* 37(Special Edition):143-171.
- Clark, Margaret S., and Harry T. Reis. 1988. "Interpersonal processes in close relationships." in *Annual Review of Psychology, vol. 39*, edited by Mark. R. Rosenzweig, and Lyman W. Porter. Annual Reviews.
- Clark, Shelley. 2000. "Son preference and sex composition of children: Evidence from India." *Demography* 37(1):95-108.
- Cole, Sally, and Lynne Phillips. 1995. *Ethnographic Feminism: Essays in Anthropology*. Carleton University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. "The Politics of Black Feminist Thought: Defining Black Feminist Thought." Pp. 3-40 in *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, edited by Patricia Hill Collins. Harper Collins.
- . 1992. "Black women and motherhood." Pp. 215-245 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne, and Marilyn Yalom. Northeastern University Press.
- Collins, Randall. 1992. "Love and Property." Pp. 119-154 in *Sociological Insights: The sociology of the Non-obvious*, edited by Randall Collins. Oxford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. 1995. "The social organization of masculinity." Pp. 67-86 in *Masculinities*, edited by R. W. Connell. University of California Press.
- . 2000. "Making gendered people: Bodies, identities, sexualities." Pp. 449-471 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth Hess. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Cook, J., and M.M. Fonow. 1986. "Knowledge and Women's interest: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in Feminist Sociological Research." *Sociological Inquiry* 56(4):2-29.
- Cook, S.L. 2000. "Investigating the roles of context and meaning in violence against women." in *unpublished manuscript*.
- Crossman, R. K. , S. M. Stith, and M. M. Bender. 1990. "Sex role egalitarianism and marital violence." *Sex Roles* 22(5-6):293-304.

- Daga, A. S., S. J. Jejeebhoy, and S. Rajgopal. 1998. "Domestic Violence against women: An investigation of hospital casualty records, Mumbai." Pp. 28-36 in *Preventing violence, caring for survivors: Role of health professions and services in violence*. Research Center of Anusandhan Trust.
- Daly, Kathleen. 1997. "Different ways of conceptualizing sex/gender in feminist theory and their implications for criminology." *Theoretical Criminology* 1(1):25-51.
- Daly, K. 2003. "Family Theory versus the theories families live by." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65(4):771-784.
- Das, Veena. 1975. "Marriage Among the Hindus." in *Indian Women*, edited by Devaki Jain. Ministry of Information Broadcasting.
- Das, V. 1996. "Sexual violence, discursive formations and the state." in *International Conference on Gender Perspectives in Population, Health and Development in India*.
- Dasgupta, Shamita Das, and Sujata Warriar. 1996. "In the Footsteps of "Arundhati" : Asian Indian Women's Experiences of Domestic Violence in the United States." *Violence Against Women* 2(3):238-259.
- Datar, Chhaya. 1993. "The Women's Movement in Maharashtra." Pp. 1-50 in *The Struggle Against Violence*, edited by Chhaya Datar. Stree.
- Davis, Miranda. 1994. "Women's Organization against Rape in India: Report of a National Meeting." Pp. 60-75 in *Women and Violence*, edited by Miranda Davies. Zed Books.
- Davis, Robert C., Edna Erez, and Nancy Avitabile. 2001. "Access to Justice for Immigrants who are Victimized : The Perspectives of Police and Prosecutors." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 12(3):183-196.
- D'Cruz, Premilla, and Shalini Bharat. 2001. "Beyond Joint and Nuclear: The Indian Family Revisited." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 32(2):167-194.
- Delphy, Christine, and Diana Leonard. 1992. "The family as an economic system: Theoretical outline." Pp. 129-162 in *Familiar Exploitation*, edited by Christine Delphy, and Diana Leonard. Blackwell.
- Denzin, Norman K. 1984. "Toward a Phenomenology of Domestic, Family Violence." *The American Journal of Sociology* 90(3):483-513.
- DeReus, L.A., A. Few, and L. B. Blume. 2003. "Theorizing identities and intersectionalities: Third Wave feminism, critical race theory, and families." in *National Council on Family Relations*, edited by Paper Presented at Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop.
- Derne, Steve. 1999. "Making Sex Violent: Love as Force in Recent Hindi Films." *Violence Against Women* 5(5):548-575.
- Desai, Neera, and Maithreyi Krishnaraj. 1990. *Women and Society in India*. Ajanta Books International.
- Desai, Neera, Maithreyi Krishnaraj, Surinder Jetley, and Malavika Karlekar. 1990. *Women and Society in India*. Ajanta.
- Deshpande, Ashwini. 2001. "Casting Off Servitude: Assessing Caste and Gender Inequality in India." Pp. 328-348 in *Feminism and Antiracism: International Struggles for Justice*, edited by & Blee F. W. Twine, K. M. New York University Press.
- DeVault, Marjorie. 1996. "Talking back to sociology: Distinctive contributions of feminist methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:29-50.
- DeVault, Marjorie L. 1990. "Talking and listening from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for Interviewing and Analysis." *Social Problems* 37(1):96-116.
- . 1996. "Talking back to Sociology: Distinctive Contributions of Feminist Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:29-50.

- Diamond, Lisa M., and Lisa G. Aspinwall. 2003. "Emotion Regulation across Life Span: An integrative perspective emphasizing Self-Regulation, Positive Affect, and Dyadic Processes." *Motivation and Emotions* 27(2):125-156.
- Dixon-Mueller, R. 1993. *Population Policy and Women's Rights: Transforming Reproductive Choice*. Praeger.
- Dobash, Emerson, and Russell Dobash. 1992. *Women, Violence, and Social Change*. Routledge.
- Dobash, Emerson, Russell Dobash, Margo Wilson, and Martin Daly. 1993. "The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence." *Social Problems* 39:71-91.
- Dobash, R. Emerson, and Russell Dobash. 1979. "Violence against wives: a case against the patriarchy: The Nuclear Family and the chastisement of wives." Pp. 1-13, 48-74 in *Violence against Wives: A case against the Patriarchy*, edited by Emerson Dobash, and Russell Dobash. Free Press.
- Doezema, Jo. 1998. "Forced to Choose: Beyond the Voluntary vs. Forced Prostitution Dichotomy." in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, edited by Kamala Kempadoo, and Jo Doezema. Routledge.
- Dunn, Jennifer, and Melissa Powell. 2005. "Where they are at: Domestic violence victim advocacy and the social construction of agency." in *Midwest Sociological Society*. Minnesota.
- Duvvury, Nata, Caren Grown, and Jennifer Redner. 2004. "Costs of Intimate Partner Violence at the Household and Community Levels: An Operational Framework for Developing Nations." in *Report for the ICRW*. International Center for Research on Women.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, Elizabeth Hess, and Gloria Jacobs. 1986. "Conclusion." Pp. 192-208 in *Re-making Love: The feminization of Sex*, edited by Barbara Ehrenreich, Elizabeth Hess, and Gloria Jacobs. The Free Press.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara, and Arlie Russell Hochschild. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. Henry Holt and Company, Metropolitan Books.
- Elizabeth, V. 2000. "Patterns and Trends of Domestic Violence in India: An examination of court records." Pp. 34-38 in *Domestic Violence in India: A Summary Record of Four Record Case*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research on Women.
- Emerson, Robert M. 1987. "Four ways to improve the craft of fieldwork." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 16(1):69-89.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, and L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic field notes*. University of Chicago Press.
- Enslin, Elizabeth. 1994. "Beyond Writing: Feminist Practice and the Limitations of Ethnography." *Cultural Anthropology* 9(4):537-568.
- Evans, Lisa. 2001. "Desperate Lovers and Wanton Women: Press representations of domestic violence." *Hecate* 27(2):147.
- Evans, Mary. 1998. "'Falling in Love with Love is Falling for Make Believe: Ideologies of Romance in the Post-Enlightenment Culture." *Theory, Culture and Society* 15(3-4):265-275.
- Fenton, Zanita E. 1998. "Domestic Violence in Black and White: Racialized Gender Stereotypes in Gender Violence." *Columbia Journal of Gender and the Law* 8(1):1-42.
- Fernandez, M. 1997. "Domestic Violence by Extended Family Members in India: Interplay of Gender and Generation." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12(3):433-455.
- Ferraro, K. J. 1997. "Battered Women: Strategies for survival." Pp. 124-140 in *Violence among Intimate Partners: Patterns, causes, and effects*, edited by A. Carderelli. Macmillan.

- Ferree, Myra Marx. 1990. "Beyond separate spheres: Feminism and family research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52:866-884.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Elaine Hall. 1996. "Rethinking stratification from a feminist perspective: Gender, race, and class in mainstream textbooks." *American Sociological Review* 61(3):929-950.
- Fincham, F. D. 2000. "The kiss of the porcupines: From attributing responsibility to forgiving." *Personal Relationships* 7(1):1-23.
- Firestone, Shulamith. 1970. "The culture of romance." Pp. 146-155 in *The Dialectic of Sex: The case for feminist revolution*, edited by Shulamith Firestone. Bantam.
- . 1970. *The Dialectic of Sex*. William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Flake, Dallon F. 2005. "Individual, family, and community risk markers for domestic violence in Peru." *Violence Against Women* 11(3):353-373.
- Flax, Jane. 1990. "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory." in *Feminisms*, edited by Sandra Kemp, and Judith Squires. Oxford University Press.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus*. Routledge.
- Freeman, Carla, and Donna F. Murdock. 2001. "Enduring Traditions and New Directions in Feminist Ethnography in the Caribbean and Latin America." *Feminist Studies* 27(2):423-458.
- Frieze, I. H. 2000. "Violence in close relationships - Development of research area: Comment on Archer." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):681-684.
- Ganesh, Kamala. 1989. "Seclusion of Women and the Structure of Caste." Pp. 75-98 in *Gender and the Household Domain: Social and Cultural Dimensions*, edited by Leela Dube. Sage Publications.
- . 1998. "Mortality due to burns: An analysis of hospital data." Pp. 79-81 in *Preventing violence, caring for survivors: Role of health professions and services in violence*. Research Center of Anusandhan Trust.
- Gladstein, Mimi R. 1998. "Eight Lessons in Love: A Domestic Violence Reader." *The Hemingway Review* 18(1):107.
- Goel, Rashmi. 2005. "Sita's trousseau: Restorative justice, domestic violence, and South Asian culture." *Violence Against Women* 11(5):639-665.
- Goodman, L.A., M.A. Dutton, K. Weinfurt, and S. Cook. 2003. "The Intimate Partner Strategies Index: Development and application." *Violence Against Women* 9(2):163 - 186.
- Goody, J., and S.J. Tambiah. 1973. *Bride Wealth and Dowry*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gordon, Deborah, and Ruth Behar. 1995. *Women writing Culture*. University of California Press.
- Gorelick, Sherry. 1991. "Contradictions of Feminist Methodology." *Gender and Society* 5(4):459-477.
- Graham-Kevan, Nicola, and John Archer. 2001. "Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Testing Johnson's typology in four British samples."
- Gray, H. M. , and V. Foshee. 1997. "Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided and mutually violent profiles." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12:126-141.
- Grewal, Indrepal. 1998. "On the new Global Feminism and the Family of Nations: Dilemmas of Transnational Feminist Practice." in *Talking Visions*, edited by Ela Shohat. MIT Press.
- Gubar, Susan. 1998. "What ails feminist criticism?" *Critical Inquiry* 24:878.
- Gubrium, J., and J. Hostein. 2003. *Handbook of interview research*.

- Gupta, Monisha Das. 1997. "'What is Indian about You?' : A Gendered Transnational Approach to Ethnicity." *Gender and Society* 11(5):572-596.
- Hai, Ambreen. 2000. "Border work, Border trouble: Postcolonial Feminism and the Ayah in Bapsi Sidwa's *Cracking India*." *MFS Modern Fiction Series* 46(2).
- Hamberger, L. K. , J. M. Lohr, D. Bonge, and D. F. Tolin. 1996. "A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse." *Violence & Victims* 11(4):277-292.
- Harding, Sandra. 1986. "The instability of the analytical categories of feminist theory." *Signs* 11(4):645.
- Harraway, Donna. 1998. "Situated Knowledges." *Feminist Studies* 14:575-597.
- Harrison, Melissa, and Margaret E Montoya. 1996. "Voices in the Borderlands: A Colloquy on Re/constructing Identities in Re/constructed Legal Spaces." *Journal of Gender and Law* 6(1):387.
- Hartmann, Heidi. 1981. "The Family as the locus of gender, class, and political struggle: The example of housework." *Signs* 6(3):366-394.
- Hartmann, Heidi, Ellen Bravo, Charlotte Bunch, Nancy Hartsock, Roberta Spalter-Roth, Linda Williams, and Maria Blanco. 1996. "Bringing together feminist theory and practice: A collective interview." *Signs* 21(4):917-951.
- Heckman, S. 2000. "Truth and method: Feminist Standpoint theory revisited." Pp. 9-34 in *Provoking Feminisms*, edited by Carolyn Allen, and Judith Howard. University of Chicago Press.
- Hegde, Radha S. 1999. "Making Bodies, Reproducing Violence." *Violence against Women* 5(5):507-524.
- Hemmet, Julie. 2004. "Global Civil Society and the local costs of belonging: defining violence against women in Russia." *Signs* 29(3).
- Hennessy, Rosemary. 1992. *Materialist Feminism and the Politics of Discourse*. Routledge.
- Henton, June, Rodney Cate, James Koval, Sally Lloyd, and Scott Christopher. 1983. "Romance and Violence in Dating Relationship." *Journal of Family Issues* 4(3):467-482.
- Herbert, Tracy Bennett, Roxane Cohen Silver, and John H. Ellard. 1991. "Coping with an Abusive Relationship: How and why do women stay?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 53(2):311-325.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, and Patricia Leavy. 2003. *Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, and Michelle Yaiser. 2004. *Feminist Perspectives on Social Research*. Oxford University Press.
- Ho, Pensri. 2003. "Performing the 'Oriental' : Professionals and the Asian Model Minority Myth." *JAS*:149-175.
- Holman, T. B., and M.O. Jarvis. 2003. "Hostile, volatile, avoiding, and validating couple-conflict types: An investigation of Gottman's couple conflict types." *Personal Relationships* 10(2):267-282.
- Holmberg, D. , T.L. Orbuch, and J Veroff. 2004. "Chapter 2: A narrative approach to relationships and Chapter 11: What have we learned from narratives?" Pp. 4-20, 161-172 in *Thrice-told tales: Married couples tell their stories*, edited by D. Holmberg, T.L. Orbuch, and J Veroff. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., J. C. Meehan, K. Herron, U. Rehman, and G. L Stuart. 2000. "Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 68:1000-1019.

- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., N. Smutzler, and E. Sandin. 1997. "A brief review of the research on husband violence, Part II: The psychological effects of husband violence on battered women and their children." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 2(2):179-213.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., G. L. Stuart, and G. Hutchinson. 1997. "Violence versus nonviolent husbands: Differences in attachment patterns, dependency, and jealousy." *Journal of Family Psychology* 11(3):314-331.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2000. "Feminism and Migration." *Annals* 571:107-120.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette. 2001. *Domestica: Immigrant workers cleaning and caring in the shadows of affluence*. University of California Press.
- Hoschschild, Arlie. 1989. "Chapters 13-17." Pp. 188-270 in *The Second Shift*, edited by Arlie Hoschschild. Viking Publications.
- Huisman, Kimberley A. 1996. "Wife Battering in Asian American Communities : Identifying Service Needs of an Overlooked Segment of the U.S. Population." *Violence Against Women* 2(3):260-283.
- ICRW. 1998. "A presentation of a number of studies addressing various aspects of violence against women; focus on India." Pp. 1-8 in *International Center for Research on Women*.
- Inhrom, Marica C., and Lisa Whittle. 2001. "Feminism meets the 'new' epidemiology: toward an appraisal of antifeminist biases in epidemiological research on women's health." *Social Science & Medicine* 53:553-567.
- Jackman, Mary. 1994. *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. University of California Press.
- Jackman, Mary R. 1999. "Gender, violence, and harassment." Pp. 275-317 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, edited by Janet Saltzman Chafetz. Kluwer Academic.
- Jacobson, N., and J. Gottman. 1998. *When Men Batter Women: New Insights into Ending Abusive Relationships*. Simon & Schuster.
- Jaising, Indira. 2001. *Law of Domestic Violence*. Universal Law Publishing.
- Jamieson. 1999. "Intimacy Transformed? A critical look at the 'Pure Relationship'." *Sociology* 33(3):477-494.
- Jaswal, Surinder. 2000. "Health Records and Domestic Violence in Thane District, Maharashtra." Pp. 6-14 in *Domestic Violence in India: A Summary Report of Four Record Studies*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research for Women.
- Johnson, Elizabeth, and Ted Huston. 1998. "The perils of love, or why wives adapt to husbands during the transition to parenthood." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60:195-204.
- Johnson, Michael P. 1995. "Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women in U.S. families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57(283-294).
- . 1997. "Personal, moral, and structural commitment to relationships: Experiences of choice and constraint." Pp. 73-87 in *Handbook of Interpersonal Commitment and Relationship Stability*, edited by Jeffrey M. Adams, and Warren H. Johns. Kluwer Academic/ Plenum.
- Johnson, M. P. 1998. "Commitment and entrapment: Wife-beating in America." Presented at the *Ninth International Conference on Personal Relationships*. Saratoga Springs, New York.
- Johnson, Michael P. 2001. "Conflict and control: Images of symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence." in *Couples in Conflict*, edited by Alan Booth, Ann. C. Crouter, and Mari Clements. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Johnson, Michael P., and K. J. Ferraro. 2000. "Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62(4):948-963.

- Johnson, Pamela S., and Jennifer A. Johnson. 2001. "The Oppression of Women in India." *Violence Against Women* 7(9):1051-1068.
- Kali Press. 1992. "Legal Aid Handbook I: Domestic Violence." in *Kali for Women*. Gayatri Offset Press.
- Kandiyotti, Denise. 1998. "Bargaining with Patriarchy." *Gender and Society* 2:274-290.
- Kanhere, Usha. 1989. "Differential Socialization of Boys and Girls : A study of the lower socio-economic households among Gujarati Caste/Communities in Ahmedabad." Pp. 31 - 53 in *Gender and the Household Domain : Social and Cultural Dimension*, edited by Maithreyi Krishnaraj & Karuna Chanana. Sage Publications.
- Kantor, G. K. , and J. L. Jasinski. 1998. "Dynamics and risk factors in partner violence." Pp. 1-43 in *Partner Violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*, edited by J. L. Jasinski, and L. M. Williams. Sage.
- Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1989. "Organizing Against Violence: Strategies of the Indian Women's Movement." *Pacific Affairs* 62(1):53-71.
- Kaushik, Sunanda. 1990. "Social and Treatment Issues in Wife Battering: A Reconsideration." Pp. 23-34 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arihant Publishers.
- Kelkar, Govinda. 1992. "Stopping the Violence Against Women: Fifteen Years of Activism in India." Pp. 74-99 in *Freedom from Violence: Women's Strategies from around the world*, edited by Margaret Schuler. Widbooks.
- Kelley, Harold H. 1986. "Personal Relationships: Their Nature and significance." Pp. 3-19 in *The Emerging Field of Personal Relationships*, edited by R. Gilmour, and S. Duck. Laurance Erlbaum.
- Kempadoo, Kamala. 1998. "Introduction." in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, edited by Kamala Kempadoo, and Jo Doezema. Routledge.
- Kersti, Yllo, and Murray A. Straus. 1981. "Interpersonal Violence among."
- Keshwaar, S. 1991. "Scream silently, or the neighbours will hear: The crying need for a law against domestic violence." *Lawyers* April:4-9.
- Khoury, Mai Y. El, Mary Ann Dutton, Lisa A. Goodman, Lisa Engel, Robin J. Belamaric, and Meghan Murphy. 2004. "Ethnic differences in battered women's formal help-seeking strategies: A focus on health, mental health, and spirituality." *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 10(4):383-393.
- Kirkwood, Catherine. 1993. "Leaving Abusive Partners." Sage Publications.
- Kirkwood, C. 1993. *Leaving abusive partners: From the scars of survival to the wisdom of change*. Sage.
- Kirsch, Gesa E. 1999. *Ethical Dilemmas in Feminist Research*. State University of New York Press.
- Kishwar, Madhu & Suguna, Celine. 1999. "When homes are torture chambers: Vimochana's work with victims of domestic violence." *Manushi* 110:17-24.
- Knudson-Martin, Carmen, and Anne Mahoney. 1998. "Language Processes in the construction of equality in marriages." *Family Relations* 47:81-91.
- Komter, Aafke. 1989. "Hidden power in marriage." *Gender and Society* 3:187-216.
- Koslowski, Rey. 2001. "Economic Globalization, Human Smuggling, and Global Governance." in *Global Human Smuggling : Comparative Perspectives*, edited by David Kyle, and Rey Koslowski. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kranichfeld, Marion. 1996. "Rethinking family power." *Journal of Family Issues* 8(1):42-56.
- Krishnan, Suneeta. 2005. "Do structural inequalities contribute to marital violence: Ethnographic evidence from South India." *Violence Against Women* 11(6):759-775.

- Krishnaraj, M. 1989. "Introduction." in *Gender and the household domain: Social and cultural dimension*, edited by M.K.K.Chanana. Sage Publications.
- Kurien, Prema. 1999. "Gendered Ethnicity : Creating a Hindu Indian Identity in the United States." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(4):648-670.
- Kvale, S. 1996. *Interviews*. Sage Publications.
- Kyle, David, and Rey Koslowski. 2001. "Introduction." in *Global Human Smuggling : Comparative Perspectives*, edited by David Kyle, and Rey Koslowski. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Laquer, Thomas W. 1992. "The facts of fatherhood." Pp. 155-175 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne, and Marilyn Yalom. Northeastern University.
- Lather, P. 1988. "Feminist Perspective on Empowering Research Methodologies." *Women's Studies International Forum* 11(6):569-581.
- Leonard, Karen. 1979. "Women in India: Some recent perspectives." *Pacific Affairs* 52(1):95-107.
- Leone, Janel M., Michael P. Johnson, Catherine M. Cohan, and Susan Lloyd. 2004. "Consequences of male partner violence for low-income ethnic women." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66 (2): 471-489.
- Levinson, D. 1989. "Social structure and family violence, wife beating and sexual inequality: Pulling the pieces together." Pp. 52-97 in *Family violence in a cross-cultural perspective*, edited by D. Levinson. Sage.
- Lips, Hillary. 1995. "Gender Role Socialization: Lessons in femininity." in *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, edited by Jo Freeman. Mayfield.
- Lloyd, Sally. 1991. "The Darkside of Courtship : Violence and Sexual Exploitation." *Family Relations* 40(1):14-20.
- Lloyd, S. A. , and B. C. Emery. 2000. "'I never thought it would happen to me': The dark side of Romance: A framework for understanding physical and sexual aggression in courtship." Pp. 1-44 in *The Dark Side of Courtship: Physical and Sexual Aggression*, edited by S. A. Lloyd, and B. C. Emery. Sage.
- Lorber, Judith. 1994. "Night to his day: The social construction of gender." Pp. 13-36 in *Paradoxes of Gender*, edited by Judith Lorber. Yale University Press.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. "Poetry is not a luxury." Pp. 36-39 in *Sister Outsider : Essays and Speeches*, edited by Audre Lorde. Crossing Press.
- Lugodh, L. Abu. 1998. *Introduction*.
- MacKinnon, Catharine. 1989. "Sexuality." Pp. 126-154 in *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*, edited by Catharine MacKinnon. Harvard University Press.
- Macmillan, R. , and R. Gartner. 1999. "When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 61(4):947-958.
- Madan, T. 1975. "Structural Implications of Marriage in North India : Wife Givers and Wife Takers among Pandits of Kashmir." in *Contributions to Indian Sociology*.
- Madhurima. 1996. *Violence against women: Dynamics of conjugal relations*. Gyan Publishing House.
- Magar, Veronica. 2001. "Resisting Domestic Violence and Caste Inequality: All- Women Courts in India." Pp. 37-58 in *Feminism and Antiracism: International Struggles for Justice*, edited by France Winddance Twine & Kathleen M. Blee. New York University Press.
- Mahajan, A. 1990. "Investigators of Wife Battering." Pp. 1-10 in *Violence against women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arihant Publishers.

- . 1990. "Sources of family tensions in ancient India." Pp. 119-128 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arihant Publishers.
- Maher, Lisa, and Kathleen Daly. 1996. "Women in the street level drug economy: Continuity or Change." *Criminology* 34(4):465-492.
- Mahoney, Maureen A. 1996. "The Problem of Silence in Feminist Psychology." *Feminist Studies* 22(3):603-625.
- Mani, Lata. 1998. *Contentious Traditions*. University of California Press.
- Manokha, Ivan. 2004. "Modern Slavery and Fair Trade Products: Buy One and Set Someone Free." in *The Political Economy of New Slavery*, edited by Christien van den Anker. Palgrave Macmillian.
- Margolis, Diane Rothbard. 1993. "Women's Movements around the World: Cross-Cultural Comparisons." *Gender and Society* 7(3):379-399.
- Marks, Stephen. 1987. "An epistemological basis for primary explanations in family science." in *National Council on Family Relations*.
- Marrujo, B. , and M. Kreger. 1996. "Definitions of roles in abusive lesbian relationships." Pp. 23-33 in *Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships*, edited by M. Renzetti, and C. H. Miley. The Haworth Press.
- Marshall, L. L. 1996. "Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct cluster." *Journal of Family Violence* 11(4):379-409.
- . 1999. "Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low-income women." *Violence & Victims* 14(1):69-88.
- Martin, S. L., B. Kilgallen, A. O. Tsui, and K Maitra. 1999. "Sexual behaviors and reproductive health outcomes; Associations with wife abuse in India." *The Journal of the American Medical* 282(20):1967-1972.
- Martin, S. L. Tsui, A. O., Maitra K. & Marinshaw, R. 1999. "Domestic violence in Northern India." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 150(4):417-426.
- McLaughlin, Lisa. 2004. "Feminism and the political economy of transnational public space." *The Sociological Review* 52(1):156.
- McLeer, Anne. 1998. "Saving the Victim: Recuperating the Language of the Victim and Reassessing Global Feminism." *Hypatia* 12(1):41.
- McWilliams, M. 1998. "Violence against women in societies under stress." Pp. 111-140 in *Rethinking Violence against Women*, edited by R. E. Dobash, and R. P. Dobash. Sage.
- Mehra, Rekha. 1997. "Women, Empowerment, And Economic Development." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 554 (The Role of NGOs: Charity and Empowerment):136-149.
- Mehrotra, Meeta. 1999. "The Social Construction of Wife Abuse : Experiences of Asian Indian Women in the United States." *Violence Against Women* 5(6):619-640.
- Mehta, Meenal. 1998. "Gender violence: Caring for survivors." Pp. 108-109 in *Preventing violence, caring for survivors: Role of health profession and services in violence*. Research Center of Anusandhan Trust.
- Mencher, Joan P. 1989. "Women Agricultural Laborers and Land Owners in Kerala and Tamil Nadu: Some Questions About Gender and Autonomy in the Household." Pp. 117-144 in *Gender and the Household Domain: Social and Cultural Dimensions*, edited by Leela Dube. Sage Publications.
- Menjivar, Cecilia, and Olivia Salcido. 2002. "Immigrant Woman and Domestic Violence : Common Experiences in Different Countries." *Gender and Society* 16(6):898-920.

- Merrill, G. S. 1996. "Ruling the exceptions: Same-sex battering and domestic violence theory." Pp. 9-21 in *Violence in Gay and Lesbian Domestic Partnerships*, edited by M. Renzetti, and C. H. Miley. The Haworth Press.
- Michalski, Joseph H. 2004. "Making sociological sense out of trends in intimate partner violence: The social structure of violence against women." *Violence Against Women* 10(6):652-675.
- Mies, Maria. 1980. *Indian Women and Patriarchy*. Concept Publishing Company.
- Miller, Barbara Diane. 1999. "Wife Beating in India: Variations on a Theme." Pp. 203-215 in *To have and to hit*, edited by Judith K. Brown Dorothy Ayers Counts, and Jacquelyn C. Campbell. University of Illinois Press.
- Miller, Leslie J. 1990. "Violent Families and the Rhetoric of Harmony." *The British Journal of Sociology* 41(2):263-288.
- Mitra, Nishi. 1999. "Best Practices among Responses to Domestic Violence in Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh." Pp. 18-27 in *Domestic Violence in India: A Summary Report of Three Studies*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research on Women.
- Moghadam, Valentine. 2000. "Gender and the global economy." Pp. 449-471 in *Revisioning Gender*, edited by Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Beth Hess. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mohan, Vidhu. 1990. "Is there hope for battered wives?" Pp. 11-22 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arihant Publishers.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses." in *Third World Women and the politics of feminism*, edited by Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and L. Torres. Indiana University Press.
- . 2002. "Under Western Eyes Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist struggles." *Signs* 28(2):499-534.
- . 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Anna Russo, and Lourdes Torres. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- Molm, Linda. 1993. "Toward integrating micro and macro structure and agency, science, and feminism." Pp. 301-312 in *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*, edited by Paula England. Aldine De Gruyter.
- Moore, Erin P. 1994. "Law's Patriarchy in India." Pp. 89-117 in *Contested Series: Law, Hegemony and Resistance*, edited by Mindie Lazarus-Black and Susan F. Hirsch. Routledge.
- Naples, Nancy. 2003. "Deconstructing and Locating Survivor Discourse: Dynamics of Narrative, Empowerment, and Resistance for Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse." *Signs* 28(4):1151-1185.
- Narasimhan, Sakuntala. 1994. "India: From Sati to Sex Determination Tests." Pp. 43-52 in *Women and Violence*, edited by Miranda Davies. Zed Books.
- . 2000. "A married women's right to live: Dowry-related deaths on the rise." *Ms* 10(6):77-81.
- Narayan, Uma. 1997. "Contesting Cultures: Westernization, Respect for culture and Third World Feminists." in *The Second Wave: A reader in Feminist Theory*, edited by Linda J. Nicholson. Routledge.
- . 1997. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, traditions and third world feminism*. Routledge.
- Narayan, Uma, and Sandra Harding. 2000. *Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a multicultural, postcolonial, and feminist world*. Indiana University Press.

- Narayana, G. 1996. "Family violence, sex and reproductive health behavior among men in Uttar Pradesh, India." *Unpublished*.
- NFHS-2. 1998-1999. *India- National Family Health Survey*. ORC macro.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 1998. *Sex and Social Justice*. Oxford University Press.
- O'Leary, K. D. 2000. "Are women really more aggressive than men in intimate relationships? Comment on Archer." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):685-689.
- Olson, L.N., Fine, L.A., and Sally Lloyd. 2003. "A dialectical approach to theorizing about violence between intimates." in *National Council on Family Relationships*, edited by Paper Presented at the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop.
- Omvedt, Gail. 1990. *Violence against Women: New movements and New Theories in India*. Pauls Press.
- Ong, Aihwa. 1987. *Spirits of Resistance and Capitalist Discourse*. State University of New York Press.
- Ortner, Sherry B. 1995. "Resistance and the Problem of Ethnographic Refusal." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 37(1):173-193.
- Oswald, R. F., L. B. Blume, and Stephen Marks. 2003. "Decentering Heteronormativity: Transforming family studies." in *National Council on Family Relationships*, edited by Paper Presented at the Theory Construction and Research Methodology Workshop.
- Oyewumi, Oyeronke. 1997. *The invention of woman*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Pande, R. 2000. "From anti-arrack to total prohibition: the women's movement in Andhra Pradesh, India." *Gender, Technology & Development* 4(1):131-144.
- Papanek, Hanna. 1989. "Family Status-Production Work: Women's Contribution to Social Mobility and Class Differentiation." Pp. 97-116 in *Gender and the Household Domain: Social and Cultural Dimensions*, edited by Leela Dube. Sage Publications.
- Parihar, Lalita. 1990. "Battered Wife Syndrome: Some socio-legal aspects." Pp. 35-44 in *Violence against Women*, edited by Sushma Sood. Arihant Publishers.
- Patai, Daphne. 1988. "Who's calling Whom 'Subaltern?'" *Women and Language* 11(2):23.
- Pathak, I, & AWAG. 1998. "Feminist counseling and its methodology." Pp. 63-69 in *Preventing violence, caring for survivors: Role of health professions and services in violence*. Research Center of Anusandhan Trust.
- Peacock, Sunita. 2003. "Violence and Abuse in the Lives of South Asian Women." in *Violence and the Body : Race, Gender, and the State*, edited by Arturo J. Aldama. Indiana University Press.
- Pence, E. L. , and C. McDonnell. 1999. "Developing policies and protocols." Pp. 41-64 in *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*, edited by M. F. Shepard, and E. L. Spence. Sage.
- Pence, Ellen. L., and Michael Paymar. 1993. *Education Groups for men who batter: the Duluth model*. Springer Publications.
- Peplau, Anne Letitia. 1994. "Men and women in love." Pp. 19-49 in *Gender, Families, and Close Relationships: Feminist Research Journeys*, edited by Donna Sollic, and Leigh Leslie. Sage Publications.
- . 2001. "Rethinking women's sexual orientation: An interdisciplinary, relationship focused approach." *Personal Relationships* 8:1-19.
- Perry-Jenkins, Maureen, Rena Repetti, and Ann Crouter. 2000. "Work and Family in the 1990s." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:981-998.
- Pheterson, Gail. 1993. "The Whore Stigma: Female Dishonor and Male Unworthiness." *Social Text* 37(Special Edition):39-64.

- Pigg, Stacy Leigh, and Linnet Pike. 2004. "Knowledge, Attitudes, Beliefs, and Practices: The Social Shadow of AIDS and STD Prevention in Nepal." in *Sexual Sites, Seminal Attitudes : Sexualities, Masculinities and Culture in South Asia*, edited by Sanjay Srivastava. Sage Publications.
- Pleck, Elizabeth, Joseph H. Pleck, M. Grossman, and Pauline B. Bart. 1978. "The battered data syndrome: A comment on Steinmetz's article." *Victimology* 2(499-509).
- Pogrebrin, Letty Cottin. 1983. "The enduring nest." Pp. 21-37 in *Family Politics: Love and Power on an Intimate Frontier*, edited by Letty Cottin Pogrebrin. McGraw Hill.
- Poonacha, Veena, and Divya Pandey. 1999. "Responses to Domestic Violence in Karnataka and Gujarat." Pp. 28-41 in *Domestic Violence in India: Summary Report of Three Studies*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research on Women.
- Prashad, Shally. 1999. "Medicolegal response to violence against women in India." *Violence against Women* 5(5):478-506.
- Preisser, Amita Bhandari. 1999. "Domestic Violence in South Asian Communities in America : Advocacy and Intervention." *Violence Against Women* 5(6):684-699.
- Presser, Harriet. 1997. "Demography, feminism, and the science-policy nexus." *Population and Development Review* 23(2):295-331.
- Puente, Slyvia, and Dov Cohen. 2003. "Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 29(4):449.
- Purkayastha, Bandana, Mangala Subramaniam, Manisha Desai, and Sunita Bose. 2003. "The Study of Gender in India : A Partial Review." *Gender and Society* 17(4):503-524.
- Pyke, Karen D., and Denise L. Johnson. 2003. "Asian American Women and Racialized Femininities : "Doing" Gender across Cultural Worlds." *Gender and Society* 17(1):33-53.
- Quattara, Mariam, P. Sen, and M. Thomson. 1998. "Forced marriage, forced sex: The perils of childhood for girls." *Gender and Development* 6(3):27-33.
- Radford, Jill. 2000. "Theorizing commonalities and difference: sexual violence, law and feminist activism in India and the UK." Pp. 167-184 in *Women, violence and strategies for action: Feminist research, policy and practice*, edited by Melissa Friedberg and Lynne Harne Jill Radford. Open University Press.
- Raj, Anita, and Jay Silverman. 2002. "Violence Against Immigrant Women : The Roles of Culture, Context, and Legal Immigrant Status on Intimate Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 8(3):367-398.
- Rajan, Rajeshwari Sunder, and You-me Park. 2004. "Postcolonial Feminism/Post colonialism and Feminism." in *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies: A Historical Introduction*, edited by Henry Schwarz, and Sangeeta Ray. Blackwell Publishing
- Rajgopal, Shoba S. 2003. "The Politics of Location : Ethnic Identity and Cultural Conflict in the Cinema of the South Asian Diaspora." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 27(1):49-66.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline, and Janet Holland. 2003. "Feminist Methodology : Challenges and Choices." *Asian Journal of Women's Studies* 9(4):125-128.
- Rao, Sandhya , Indhu S., Ashima Chopra, and Nagamani S. N. 2000. "Domestic Violence: A Study of Organizational Data." Pp. 15-24 in *Domestic Violence in India: A Summary Report of Four Records Studies*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research on Women.
- Rao, V. 1998. "Wife abuse, its causes and its impact on intra-household resource allocation in rural Karnataka: A "participatory" econometric analysis." Pp. 94-121 in *Gender, population and development*, edited by Ratna M. Sudarshan Marithreyi Krishnaraj, Abusaleh Shariff. Oxford University Press.

- Ray, Raka. 1999. *Fields of Protest: Women's Movement in India*. University of Minnesota.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. "Conclusions." Pp. 240-269 in *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, edited by Shulamit Reinharz, and Lynn Davidman. Oxford University Press.
- Renzetti, Claire. 1992. *Violent Betrayal: Partner Abuse in Lesbian Relationships*. Sage Publications.
- Report, INCLEN. 1999. "INDIASAFE: Studies of Abuse in Family Environments in India" in *Final end-of-project report for PROWID International Center for Research on Women*.
- Report, PROWID. 1998. "Best Practices among Responses to Domestic Violence: A study of government and non-governmental responses in Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra." in *Final end-of-project report for PROWID International Center for Research on Women*.
- Reyes, Angela. 2002. "'Are you losing your culture?': Poetics, Indexicality, and Asian American Identity." *Discourse Studies* 4(2).
- Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian experience." *Signs* 5(4):631-660.
- Richie, M. P. 1996. *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered Black Women*. Routledge.
- Riley, Nancy. 1997. "Gender, power, and population change." *Population Bulletin* 52:1-48.
- Risman, Barbara. 1990. "Methodological implications of feminist scholarship for family studies." in *National Council on Family Relations annual meetings*.
- . 2004. "Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism." *Gender and Society* 18(4):429-450.
- Risman, Barbara, and Danette Johnson-Sumerford. 1998. "Doing it fairly: A study of postgender marriages." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60:23-40.
- Rose, Suzanna. 1985. "Is Romance Dysfunctional?" *International Journal of Women's Studies* 8:250-265.
- Rosen, Karen H., and Kimberly Bird. 1996. "A Case of Woman Abuse : Gender Ideologies, Power Paradoxes, and Unresolved Conflict." *Violence Against Women* 2(3):302-321.
- Rude, Darlene. 1999. "Reasonable Men and Provocative Women : An Analysis of Gendered Domestic Homicide in Zambia." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 25(1):7-27.
- Runyan, Marchand and. 2000. "Introduction." in *Gender and Global Restructuring: Sightings, Sites, and Resistance*, edited by M. Marchand, and A. Sisson Runyan. Routledge.
- Saltzman, Linda E. 2004. "Definitional and methodological issues related to transnational research on intimate partner violence." *Violence Against Women* 10(7):812-830.
- Sangari, Kumkum. 2002. "Consent and Agency." Pp. 126-160 in *Women and the Politics of Violence*, edited by Taisha Abraham. Shakti Books.
- Schrager, Cynthia D. 1993. "Questioning the Promise of Self-help : A reading of *women who love too much*." *Feminist Studies* 19(1).
- Schutz, Alfred. 1967. "Weber's concept of social relationship: The motivational context of social interaction." Pp. 151-163 in *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Northwestern University Press.
- Schutz, Alfred, and Thomas Luckmann. 1973. "The social arrangement of the life-world of everyday existence." Pp. 59-92 in *The Structures of the Life-World*. Northwestern University Press.
- Scott, Joan. 1997. *Only paradoxes to offer*. Harvard University Press.
- Sengupta, Shampa. 1998. "Violence and the minds of women." Pp. 142-145 in *Preventing violence, caring for survivors: Role of health profession and services in violence*. Research Center of Anusandhan Trust.

- Sharma, Anita. 2001. "Healing the Wounds of Domestic Violence : Improving the Effectiveness of Feminist Therapeutic Interventions With Immigrant and Racially Visible Women Who Have Been Abused." *Violence Against Women* 7(12):1405-1428.
- Shiva, M. 1999. "Violence against women." *Health for the Millions* 25(1):36-38.
- Simmel, Georg. 1950. "The isolated individual and the dyad." Pp. 118-138 in *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, edited by Kurt Wolff. Free Press.
- Singh, Raghu N., and N. Prabha Unnithan. 1999. "Wife Burning: Cultural Cues for Lethal Violence Against Violence Among Asian Indians in the United States." *Violence Against Women* 5(6):641-653.
- Sinha, Mrinalini. 2000. "How History matters: Questioning the categories of 'Western' and non-Western feminisms." Pp. 168-186 in *Is Academic Feminism Dead?*, edited by University of Minnesota CAFS. New York University Press.
- . 2003. "Gender and Nation." *American Historical Association Pamphlet Series (forthcoming)*.
- Solanki, Anjali Dave and Gopika. 2000. "Special Cell for Women and Children: A Research Study on Domestic Violence." Pp. 25-33 in *Domestic Violence in India: A Summary Report of Four Records Studies*, edited by ICRW. International Center for Research on Women.
- Sprague, Joey, and Mary Zimmerman. 1993. "Overcoming dualisms: A feminist Agenda." in *Theory on Gender; Feminism on Theory*, edited by Paula England. Aldine de Gruyter.
- Srinivasan, Priyamvada. 1998. "Explanations of Domestic Violence in India and the United States: A comparative analysis." Pp. 149 in *Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections*. Southern Illinois University.
- Srivastava, Sanjay. 2004. *Sexual Sites, Seminal Attitudes : Sexualities, Masculinities and Culture in South Asia*. Sage Publications.
- Stacey, Judith. 1996. "The neo-family-values campaign." Pp. 52-82 in *In the name of the family: Rethinking family values in the postmodern age*, edited by Judith Stacey. Beacon Press.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne. 1977. "The battered husband syndrome." *Victimology* 2:499-509.
- Stets, J. E. , and M. A. Pirog-Good. 1990. "Interpersonal control and courtship aggression." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 7(3):371-394.
- Stith, S. M., K. H. Rosen, K. A. Middleton, A. L. Busch, K. Lundeberg, and R. P. Carlton. 2000. "The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 62(3):640-654.
- Straus, Murray, and Christine Smith. 1990. "Family patterns and primary prevention of family violence." Pp. 507-526 in *Physical Violence in American Families*, edited by Murray A. Straus, and Richard J. Gelles. Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A. 1990. "The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on reliability and validity." Pp. 49-73 in *Physical Violence in American Families*, edited by M. A. Straus, and Richard J. Gelles. Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A. 1999. "The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis." Pp. 17-44 in *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, edited by X. B. Arriaga, and S. Oskamp. Sage Publications.
- Straus, M. A., and C. Smith. 1990. "Family patterns and primary prevention of family violence." Pp. 507-526 in *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence*, edited by M. A. Straus, and R. J. Gelles. Transaction Press.
- Strube, Michael J, and Linda S Barbour. 1983. "The Decision to Leave an Abusive Relationship: Economic Dependence and Psychological Commitment." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45(4):785-793.

- Sullivan, C. M. , and D. I. Bybee. 1999. "Reducing violence using community-based advocacy for women with abusive partners." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 67(1):43-53.
- Swan, S.C. , and D. L. Snow. 2002. "A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships." *Violence against Women*.
- Tambiah, Stanley J. 1989. "Bridewealth and Dowry Revisited: The Position of Women in Sub-Sahara Africa and North India." *Current Anthropology* 30(4):413-435.
- Thompson, Linda. 1991. "Family Work: Women's sense of Fairness." *Journal of Family Issues* 12:181-196.
- . 1992. "Feminist methodologies for family studies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 54:3-18.
- . 1992. "Feminist Methodology for Family Studies." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 54(1):3-18.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1982. "Feminist Rethinking of the Family." in *The Anti Social Family*, edited by Barret Michelle & Mary McIntosh. Verso.
- . 1992. "Feminism and the family: Two decades of thought." Pp. 3-30 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne, and Marilyn Yalom. Northeastern University Press.
- Tolentino, Roland B. 1996. "Bodies, Letters, Catalogs: Filipinas in Transnational Space." *Social Text* 48:49-76.
- Towns, Alison, and Peter Adams. 2000. "'If I really loved him enough, He would be okay' : Women's accounts of Male Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 6(6):558-585.
- Udry, J.R. 2000. "Biological limits of gender construction." *American Sociological Review* 65:443-457.
- Upadhyaya, Krishna. 2004. "Bonded Labor in South Asia: India, Nepal, and Pakistan." in *The Political Economy of New Slavery*, edited by Christien van den Anker. Palgrave Macmillian.
- Vindhya, U. 2000. "Dowry deaths in Andhra Pradesh, India: Response of the criminal justice system." *Violence Against Women* 6(10):1085-1108.
- Visaria, L. 1999. "Violence against women in India : Evidence from rural Gujarat." Pp. 9-17 in *Domestic violence in India: A summary report of three studies*. International Center for Research on Women.
- Visweswaran, Kamala. 1994. *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. University of Minnesota Press.
- . 1997. "Histories of Feminist Ethnography." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26:597-621.
- Waite, Linda. 1995. "Does marriage matter?" *Demography* 32:483-507.
- Walker, Alexis. 1996. "Couples watching television: Gender, Power, and the remote control." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58(813-824).
- . 2000. "Refracted knowledge: Viewing families through the prism of social science." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:595-608.
- Ward, Katharine. 1993. "Reconceptualizing World System Theory to include women." Pp. 43-68 in *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory*, edited by Paula England. Aldien De Gruyter.
- Watenabe, Sotoko. 1998. "From Thailand to Japan: Migrant Sex Workers as Autonomous Subjects." in *Global Sex Workers: Rights, Resistance, and Redefinition*, edited by Kamala Kempadoo, and Jo Doezema. Routledge.
- Waters, Anne B. 1999. "Domestic dangers: Approaches to women's suicide in contemporary Maharashtra, India." *Violence against Women* 5(5):525-547.
- Watkins, Susan Cotts. 1993. "If all we knew about women was what we read in Demography, what would we know." *Demography* 30(4):551-577.

- Wayne, Linda D. 1996. "Silence and violence: The woman behind the wall." *Women and Language* 19(2):1-5.
- Weber, Max. 1947. "The concept of social relationship." Pp. 118-120 in *The theory of social and economic organization*, edited by Talcott Parsons. Free Press.
- . 1947. "Types of solidary social relationships." Pp. 136-143 in *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited by Talcott Parsons. Free Press.
- Weeden, Chris. 1999. *Feminism, Theory and the Politics of Difference*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Weigel, D.J. , and C Murray. 2000. "The paradox of stability and change in relationships: What does chaos theory offer for the study of romantic relationships?" *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 17(3):425-449.
- West, Candace, and Sarah Fenstermaker. 2002. "Doing difference." Pp. 55-81 in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*, edited by Sarah Fenstermaker, and Candace West. Routledge.
- West, Candace, and Don Zimmerman. 2002. "Doing gender." Pp. 3-23 in *Doing Gender, Doing Difference*, edited by Sarah Fenstermaker, and Candace West. Routledge.
- West, C. M. 1998. "Leaving a second closet: Outing partner violence in same-sex couples." Pp. 163-183 in *Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 years of Research*, edited by J. L. Jasinski, and L. M. Williams. Sage.
- . 1998. "Lifting the 'political gag order': Breaking the silence around partner violence in ethnic minority families." Pp. 184-209 in *Partner Violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*, edited by J. L. Jasinski, and L. M. Williams. Sage.
- White, J. W., P. H. Smith, M. P. Koss, and A. J. Figueredo. 2000. "Intimate partner aggression - What have we learned? Comment on Archer." *Psychological Bulletin* 126(5):690-696.
- Wiegman, Robyn. 1999. "What ails feminist criticism? A second opinion." *Critical Inquiry* 25:362.
- Wolf, Diane. 1996. *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*. Westview Press.
- Wood, J. T. in press. "Monsters and victims: Male felon's accounts of intimate partner violence." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.
- . 2001. "The normalization of violence in heterosexual romantic relationships: Women's narratives of love and violence." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 18(2):239-261.
- Wright, Melissa. 1999. "The politics of relocation: gender, nationality, and value in a Mexican maquiladora." *Environment and Planning* 31(9):1601-1617.
- Yick, Alice G., and Pauline Agbayani-Siewert. 1997. "Perceptions of Domestic Violence in a Chinese American Community." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12(6):832-846.
- Yllo, Kersti. 1988. "Political and methodological debates in wife abuse research." Pp. 28-50 in *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*, edited by Kersti Yllo, and Michelle Bograd. Sage Publications.
- Yllo, K. A. , and M. A. Straus. 1990. "Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors." Pp. 383-399 in *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*, edited by M. A. Straus, and R. J. Gelles. Transaction.
- Yoshioka, Marianne R., Jennifer DiNoia, and Komal Ullah. 2001. "Attitudes Toward Marital Violence : An Examination of Four Asian Communities." *Violence Against Women* 7(8):900-926.
- Zaretsky, Eli. 1982. "The place of family in the origins of the welfare state." Pp. 188-224 in *Rethinking the family: Some feminist questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne, and Marilyn Yalom. Longman.

- Zatz, Noah D. 1997. "Sex Work/Sex Act: Law, Labor, Desire in Constructions of Prostitution." *Signs* 22(2):277-308.
- Zink, Therese, C. Jeffrey Jacobson, Saundra Regan, Bonnie Fisher, and Stephanie Pabst. 2006. "Older Women's Descriptions and Understandings of their Abusers." *Violence Against Women* 12(9):851-865.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca. 1992. "Family, race, and poverty in the Eighties." Pp. 49-70 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne, and Marilyn Yalom. Northeastern University Press.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca, and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism." *Feminist Studies* 22(2):321-331.
- Zvonkovic, Anisa, Kathleen Greaves, Cynthia Schmiede, and Leslie Hall. 1996. "The marital construction of gender through work and family decisions: A qualitative analysis." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 58:92-100.

APPENDIX A: FIRST FIELDWORK INTERVIEW

FIRST INTERVIEW

General Questions

First Interview	
Case ID#:	_____
Sample ID#:	_____
Date:	_____
Start Time:	_____
End Time:	_____
Interview #	_____

1. Full Time Household Roster

First Name	Age	Marital Status					Gender		Relationship	Code
		Mar	Sep	Div	Wid	NM	Fem	Male		
(1)(Respondent)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(2)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(3)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(4)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(5)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(6)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(7)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(8)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(9)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(10)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(11)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(12)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		
(13)		1	2	3	4	5	0	1		

2. What is your Religion?

- 00 Hindu
- 01 Muslim
- 02 Christian
- 03 Sikh
- 04 Buddhist / Neo Buddhist
- 05 Jain
- 06 Jewish
- 07 Zoroastrian/ Parsi
- 08 No Religion
- 09 Other_____

3. What is your caste or tribe?

- 00 Caste _____ (specify)
- 01 Tribe _____ (specify)
- 02 No Caste/Tribe
- 03 Refused to answer

4. Is this a scheduled caste, a scheduled tribe, other 'backward' caste or none of them?

- 00 Scheduled Caste
- 01 Scheduled Tribe
- 02 Other Backward Caste
- 03 None of them

5. What is your Native Language?

- | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|---------------|
| 00 Assamese | 04 Hindi | 08 Manipuri | 12 Konkani | 16 Urdu |
| 01 Bengali | 05 Kannada | 09 Marathi | 13 Sindhi | 17 Other, |
| 02 English | 06 Kashmiri | 10 Nepali | 14 Tamil | Specify _____ |
| 03 Gujarati | 07 Malayalam | 11 Punjabi | 15 Telugu | |

Education

6. Can you read?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

7. Can you write?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

8. Have you ever attended school?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

9. If Yes, what was the highest grade in school that you have completed?

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|
| None : | 00 | | | | |
| Primary School: | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 |
| Secondary School | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 |
| Senior Secondary School: | 11 | 12 | | | |
| College: | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | |
| Graduate/Professional School: | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22+ |

Marital Relationship

(21)10. What was the relationship of your husband's family to your family before your marriage?

- 00 Patrilateral
- 01 Matrilateral
- 02 No Relation

(22)11. Whose decision was it to marry your husband?

- 00 Respondent
- 01 Parents
- 02 Relatives
- 03 Other parties, Specify _____
- 03 Jointly with Parents

- 04 Jointly with Relatives
- 05 Jointly with Other Parties, Specify _____

- (23)12. How would you characterize your marriage?
- 00 Arranged Marriage (you did not know your husband at all)
 - 01 Love Marriage (you knew him and you chose to get married to him)
 - a. with your parents' consent, but not his parents' consent
 - b. without your parents' consent, but with his parents' consent
 - c. with his and your parents' consent
 - d. without his and your parents' consent
 - 02 Love/Arranged Marriage (you knew him, but the marriage was arranged by his and your parents)
 - 03 Any other, Specify _____

- (24)13. Were your parents happy with the marriage?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes
 - 02 Ambiguous
 - 03 Not Sure
 - 04 Other, Specify _____

- (25)14. Were your husband's parents happy with the marriage?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes
 - 02 Ambiguous
 - 03 Other, Specify _____

- (24)15. Are your parents happy with the marriage now?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes
 - 02 Ambiguous
 - 03 Other, Specify _____

- (25)16. Are your husband's parents happy with the marriage now?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes
 - 02 Ambiguous
 - 03 Other, Specify _____

Marital Quality

(26) 17. The numbers on the following line represent degrees of happiness in your relationship. Please give me the number which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, in your relationship.

Very Unhappy 1 2 3 4 5 6 Very Happy

(27)18. The following is a list on which couples often have disagreements. How often have you had open disagreements about each of the following:

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
a. Household Tasks	00	01	02	03
b. Money/Expenditure	00	01	02	03
c. Spending time together	00	01	02	03
d. Sex	00	01	02	03
e. Children	00	01	02	03
f. Aims, Goals of Life	00	01	02	03
g. Relatives and Parents	00	01	02	03
h. Alcohol use	00	01	02	03
i. Labor force participation	00	01	02	03
j. Social life	00	01	02	03
k. Friends	00	01	02	03
l. Extra marital affair	00	01	02	03
m. Second wife/marriage	00	01	02	03

(28)19. During the past year, have you ever thought that your marriage might be in trouble?

00 No

01 Yes

(29)20. If yes, how often have you considered divorce, separation or terminating the relationship?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
00	01	02	03

(33)21. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your husband are going well?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
00	01	02	03

(34)22. How often do you confide in your husband?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
00	01	02	03

(35)23. How often do you regret that you married your husband?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
00	01	02	03

(36)24. How often do you and your husband 'get on each other's nerves'?

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
00	01	02	03

(30)25. How often do you and your husband quarrel?
Never Rarely Sometimes Very Often
00 01 02 03

(31)26. How often do you leave the house after a fight?
Never Rarely Sometimes Very Often
00 01 02 03

(32)27. How often does your husband leave the house after a fight?
Never Rarely Sometimes Very Often
00 01 02 03

Husband's income

(38)28. Do you know how much money your husband earns?
00 No
01 Yes

(39)29. How much do your husband's earnings contribute to the total family earnings?
00 Almost none
01 Less than half
02 About half
03 More than half
04 All

(40)30. Does your husband give you any money?
a. For household expenditures 00 No 01 Yes
b. For personal expenditures 00 No 01 Yes

(41)31. What does your husband do with his earnings?
00 Gives the entire amount to me
01 Gives the entire amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
02 Gives the entire amount to the common household account
03 Gives most of the amount to me
04 Gives most of the amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
05 Gives most of the amount to the common household account
06 Gives some of the amount to me
07 Gives some of the amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
08 Gives some of the amount to the common household account
09 Keeps the entire amount for household expenses
10 Keeps the entire amount for personal expenses
11 Any other, specify _____

(42)32. Who mainly decides how the money your husband earns will be used?
01 Respondent
02 Husband

- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify _____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

- (43)33. How much of the household income does your husband use for his personal expenditure?
- 00 Almost none
 - 01 Less than half
 - 02 About half
 - 03 More than half
 - 04 All

Labor Force Participation

- (44)34. Aside from your own housework, are you currently working?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes

- (45)35. Do you work:
- | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|
| a. For family farm/business | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| b. Someone Else | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| c. Self-employed | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| d. Selling things | 00 No | 01 Yes |

- (46)36. What is your occupation, that is, what kind of work do you do?
Specify _____

- (47)37. In a year, how often do you do this work?
- 00 Irregular
 - 01 Seasonal
 - 02 Part-time
 - 03 Full-time
 - 04 Any other, Specify _____

Distribution of Wife's Earnings

- (48)38. How are you paid?
- 00 Not Paid
 - 01 Kind only
 - 02 Cash and Kind
 - 03 Cash only

- (49)39. Does your husband know how much money you earn?
- 00 No
 - 01 Yes

- (50)40. What do you do with your earnings?
- 00 Give the entire amount to my husband
 - 01 Give the entire amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
 - 02 Give the entire amount to the common household account

- 03 Give most of the amount to my husband
- 04 Give most of the amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
- 05 Give most of the amount to the common household account
- 06 Give some of the amount to my husband
- 07 Give some of the amount to my husband's family
Specify _____
- 08 Give some of the amount to the common household account
- 09 Keep the entire amount for household expenses
- 10 Keep the entire amount for personal expenses
- 11 Any other, specify _____

(51)41. How much do your earnings contribute to the total family earnings?

- 00 Almost none
- 01 Less than half
- 02 About half
- 03 More than half
- 04 All

(52)42. Who mainly decides how the money you earn will be used?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify _____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

Socioeconomic Status

(10)43. Does your marital household own any house?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

(11)44. Who owns this house?

Name _____

Relation to Respondent _____

(12)45. What type of building materials does your marital home have for:

- a. Roof
 - 00 Kaccha
 - 01 Semi-Pucca
 - 02 Pucca
- b. Walls
 - 00 Kaccha
 - 01 Semi-Pucca
 - 02 Pucca
- c. Floor
 - 00 Kaccha
 - 01 Semi-Pucca

02 Pucca

(13)46. Does your marital household own any agricultural land?

00 No

01 Yes

(14)47. Who owns this agricultural land?

Name _____

Relation to Respondent _____

(15)48. If yes, how big is the agricultural land or the size of the house that you or your marital household own?

Agricultural Land _____ (size and unit)

House _____ (size and unit)

(16)49. Does your marital household own any of the following and how many of each of these do you own?

a. Mattress	00	01	02	03	04	05+
b. Pressure Cooker	00	01	02	03	04	05+
c. Chair	00	01	02	03	04	05+
d. Clock/Watch	00	01	02	03	04	05+
e. Cot/Bed	00	01	02	03	04	05+
f. Table	00	01	02	03	04	05+
g. Electric Fan	00	01	02	03	04	05+
h. Bicycle	00	01	02	03	04	05+
i. Radio or Transistor	00	01	02	03	04	05+
j. Sewing Machine	00	01	02	03	04	05+
k. Telephone	00	01	02	03	04	05+
l. Refrigerator	00	01	02	03	04	05+
m. B& W T.V.	00	01	02	03	04	05+
n. Color T.V.	00	01	02	03	04	05+
o. Moped/Scooter/Motorcycle	00	01	02	03	04	05+
p. Car	00	01	02	03	04	05+
q. Computer	00	01	02	03	04	05+
r. Cell phone / Phone	00	01	02	03	04	05+

(17)50. What is the main type of kitchenware you use in your marital household?

01 Clay

02 Aluminum

03 Cast Iron

04 Brass/Copper

05 Stainless Steel

06 Other, Specify _____

(18)51. What is the main source of drinking water for you?

- 01 Piped Water
- 02 Ground Water
- 03 Well Water
- 04 Surface Water
- 05 Rain Water
- 06 Tanker Truck
- 07 Other, Specify _____

(19)52. What is the main source of lighting for your marital household?

- 01 Electricity
- 02 Kerosene
- 03 Gas
- 04 Oil
- 05 Other, Specify _____

(20)53. What type of fuel does your marital household mainly use for cooking?

- 01 Wood
- 02 Crop Residues
- 03 Dung Cakes
- 04 Coal/Coke/Lignite
- 05 Charcoal
- 06 Kerosene
- 07 Electricity
- 08 LPG
- 09 Bio-Gas
- 10 Other, Specify _____

Decision-making

(53)54. Are you allowed to have money set aside that you can use as you wish, other than spending money on household or children?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

(54)55. Who makes this decision?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify _____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

(55)56. Who makes the following decisions in your household?

a. What items to cook?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify _____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

b. Obtaining health care for yourself?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

c. Purchasing Jewelry?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

d. Purchasing Major Household items such as Refrigerator, Stove, Steel Almara etc?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

e. Your staying with parents and siblings?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

f. Decisions regarding Children's education and school-related activities?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

g. Decisions regarding Children's health care?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

h. Decisions regarding Children's discipline?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify_____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

i. Decisions regarding Children's clothing and other purchases?

- 01 Respondent
- 02 Husband
- 03 Jointly with Husband
- 04 Others in the Household, Specify _____
- 05 Jointly with Others in the Household, Specify _____

(56)57. Do you need permission to:

- | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-------|--------|
| a. Go to the Market | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| b. Visit relatives or friends
for an extended time period | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| c. Spend a social evening with | | | |
| c1. Relatives | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| c2. Neighbours | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| c3. People who you work with | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| d. Attend a social event like | | | |
| d1. Wedding | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| d2. Festivals/ceremonies | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| e. To go to work | | | |
| f. To go to school/college | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |
| g. To go for healthcare of children | 00 Not allowed to go | 01 No | 02 Yes |

(57)58. If yes, whose permission do you need?

- | | | |
|--|---------------|-----|
| a. Go to the Market | Specify _____ | N/A |
| b. Visit relatives or friends
for an extended time period | Specify _____ | N/A |
| c. Spend a social evening with | | |
| Relatives | Specify _____ | N/A |
| Neighbours | Specify _____ | N/A |
| People who you work with | Specify _____ | N/A |
| d. Attend a social event like | | |
| d1. Weddings | Specify _____ | N/A |
| d2. Festivals/ceremonies | Specify _____ | N/A |
| e. To go to jobs | Specify _____ | N/A |
| f. To go to school/college | Specify _____ | N/A |
| g. To go for healthcare of children | Specify _____ | N/A |

Control Questions

(37)59. Thinking about your husband, how often would you say he....

- | | Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Very Often |
|---|-------|--------|-----------|------------|
| a. Tries to limit your contact with
friends and family | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 |
| b. Is jealous or possessive | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 |
| c. Insists on knowing who
you are with | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 |
| d. Calls you names or puts you down
in front of others | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 |

e. Makes you feel inadequate	00	01	02	03
f. Shouts or swears at you	00	01	02	03
g. Prevents you from having access to income even if you ask	00	01	02	03

Attitudes about Domestic Violence

(57)60. Sometimes a wife can do things that bother her husband. Please tell me if you think that a husband is justified in hitting his wife in each of the following situations:

a. If he suspects her of being unfaithful?	00 No	01 Yes
b. If her natal family does not give expected money, jewellery, or other items?	00 No	01 Yes
c. If she shows disrespect for in-laws?	00 No	01 Yes
d. If she goes out without telling him?	00 No	01 Yes
e. If she neglects the house or children?	00 No	01 Yes
f. If she doesn't cook food properly?	00 No	01 Yes
g. If she does something he told her not to?	00 No	01 Yes
h. If she refuses to do something he wants her to?	00 No	01 Yes

Physical Assault

(58)61. Have you ever been beaten or mistreated physically by any person, after you were married to your husband?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

(59)62. Please identify the person(s)?

a. Mother	00 No	01 Yes
b. Father	00 No	01 Yes
c. Step Mother	00 No	01 Yes
d. Step Father	00 No	01 Yes
e. Son	00 No	01 Yes
f. Daughter	00 No	01 Yes
g. Brother/Sister	00 No	01 Yes
h. Boyfriend	00 No	01 Yes
i. Husband	00 No	01 Yes
j. Ex-husband	00 No	01 Yes
k. Son-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
l. Daughter-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
m. Mother-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
n. Father-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
o. Sister-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
p. Brother-in-law	00 No	01 Yes
q. Other Relative	00 No	01 Yes
r. Friend/Acquaintance	00 No	01 Yes
s. Teacher	00 No	01 Yes
t. Employer	00 No	01 Yes
u. Stranger	00 No	01 Yes

v. Other _____ 00 No 01 Yes

(60)63. How often have the above identified persons physically mistreated you?

	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20	
a. Mother	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
b. Father	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
c. Step Mother	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20	
d. Step Father	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
e. Son	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
f. Daughter	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
g. Brother/Sister	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
h. Boyfriend	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
i. Husband	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
j. Ex-husband	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
k. Son-in-law	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
l. Daughter-in-law	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
m. Mother-in-law	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
n. Father-in-law	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
o. Sister-in-law	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
p. Other Relative	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
q. Friend/Acquaintance	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
r. Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
s. Employer	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
t. Stranger	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A
u. Other _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	N/A

(57)64. Do you think that any of the previous individuals who have hit you were justified in hitting you?

00 No

01 Yes

(61)65. How often has your husband done the following to you?

	Never	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20
a. Threw something that could hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Twisted your arm /pulled your hair	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Pushed or shoved you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Slapped you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Grabbed you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Used a knife or a gun against you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Punched or hit you with something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Choked you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Slammed you against the wall	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Beat you up	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Burned or scalded you on purpose	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. Kicked you	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

If the respondent has not experienced any form of violence (emotional or physical), skip to the end of the interview.

- (62)66. Is your husband more likely to beat you when he is drinking or is drunk?
 00 No, it does not matter. He assaults me whether he drinks or not.
 01 Yes, he is more likely to be violence when he drinks.

- (63)67. If yes, when you husband assaults you, how often is he drunk?
 00 Never
 01 Rarely
 02 Sometimes
 04 Very Often

Coping Behavior

- (64)68. Have you ever told anyone about your husband’s physical assault towards you?
 00 No, no one
 01 One person
 02 Two or three people
 03 Several people

- (65)69. If yes, whom did you tell?
- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------|
| a. Parents | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| b. Brothers and sisters | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| c. Friends | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| d. In-laws | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| e. Neighbors | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| f. Children | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| g. Counselors | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| h. Police/Social Workers | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| i. Colleagues at Work | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| j. Religious authorities | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| k. Crisis Center/Hotline | 00 No | 01 Yes |
| l. Any other Party, Specify _____ | 00 No | 01 Yes |

- (66)70. If not, what were the reasons that you did not seek help?
- | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| a. Didn’t know where to go | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| b. Felt helpless | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| c. Bad experiences in the past | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| d. Feel people should solve their own problems | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| e. Didn’t think people could help | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| f. Didn’t feel problems were bad enough | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| g. Felt that the violence would not repeat | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| h. Felt that husband had reason to hit | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| i. Felt relatives/friends/children will disapprove | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| j. Felt relatives/ friends/ children will retaliate | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |

- h. Felt scared that my husband would leave me 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- j. Felt that it was my fate. 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- k. Felt that it was a typical husband-like behavior 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- l. Felt I won't be believed, it'll be seen as my fault 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- m. Too minor, not serious enough, not a crime 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- n. Shame, embarrassment, thought it was my fault 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- o. Didn't want anyone to know, keep it private 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- p. Didn't want involvement with police 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- q. Didn't want relationship to end 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- r. One time incident, it stopped 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- s. Didn't want children to be affected 00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM
- t. Any other reason, please specify_____

(67)71. (Problem-minimizing reactions) In general, after the violence has occurred, how often do you

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
a. Feel closer to your husband	00	01	02	03
b. Felt more respect for partner	00	01	02	03
c. Felt more respect for yourself	00	01	02	03

(68)72. (Problem focusing reactions) In general, after the violence, how often have you thought about

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
a. Ending the relationship	00	01	02	03
b. Getting counseling	00	01	02	03
c. Ways of avoiding similar incidents in the future	00	01	02	03

(69)73. After your partner physically mistreats you, do you usually attempt to do what he wants?

- 00 Try very hard to please him
- 01 Try somewhat
- 02 Try a little
- 03 Made no attempt
- 04 Wasn't sure of what he wanted
- 05 Other_____

(70)74. Did you ever hit your husband in response to his physical assault?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

(71)75. If yes, what was his response to your violence?

- 00 Things got much worse
- 01 Things got a little worse
- 02 There was no change
- 03 Helped somewhat
- 04 Helped a Great Deal

(72)76. Did you ever want to leave your husband in response to the physical assault?

- 00 No, Never
- 01 Once
- 02 Two or three times
- 03 More than three times
- 04 Often

(73)77. Have you ever actually tried to leave him?

- 00 No, Never
- 01 Once
- 02 Two or three times
- 03 More than three times
- 04 Often

(74)78. After a violent episode, how much do you rely on each of these persons for emotional support?

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often
a. Parents	00	01	02	03
b. Brothers and sisters	00	01	02	03
c. Friends	00	01	02	03
d. In-laws	00	01	02	03
e. Neighbors	00	01	02	03
f. Children	00	01	02	03
g. Counselors	00	01	02	03
h. Police/Social Workers	00	01	02	03
i. Colleagues at Work	00	01	02	03
j. Religious authorities	00	01	02	03
k. Crisis Center/Hotline	00	01	02	03
l. Any other Party	00	01	02	03

(75)79. Did you ever call on any of the following individuals to ask your husband to stop hitting you or physically mistreating you?

a. Parents	00 No	01 Yes
b. Brothers and sisters	00 No	01 Yes
c. Friends	00 No	01 Yes
d. In-laws	00 No	01 Yes
e. Neighbors	00 No	01 Yes
f. Children	00 No	01 Yes
g. Counselors	00 No	01 Yes
h. Police/Social Workers	00 No	01 Yes
i. Colleagues at Work	00 No	01 Yes
j. Religious authorities	00 No	01 Yes
k. Crisis center/Hotline	00 No	01 Yes
l. Any other Party, Specify _____	00 No	01 Yes

(76)80. Did any of the following individuals intervene on your behalf of their own accord?

a. Parents	00 No	01 Yes
------------	-------	--------

b. Brothers and sisters	00 No	01 Yes
c. Friends	00 No	01 Yes
d. In-laws	00 No	01 Yes
e. Neighbors	00 No	01 Yes
f. Children	00 No	01 Yes
g. Counselors	00 No	01 Yes
h. Police/Social Workers	00 No	01 Yes
i. Colleagues at Work	00 No	01 Yes
j. Religious authorities	00 No	01 Yes
k. Crisis center/Hotline	00 No	01 Yes
l. Any other Party, Specify _____	00 No	01 Yes

(77)81. Women who experience physical mistreatment from their husbands react to it in different ways. In your experience, what do you usually do after your husband hits you?

a. I comply with everything he wants to do	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
b. I try to stay out of his way	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
c. I make it difficult for him in the house	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
d. I withhold sex and any affection	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
e. I avoid bringing up problem areas	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
f. I shout back	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
g. I fight back	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
h. I don't do anything	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
i. Talk to my husband about ending the violence	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
j. I withdraw physically from him	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
k. I withdraw emotionally from him	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
l. I become very silent	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
m. I apologized for my part in the violence	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
n. Don't think about the violence because it is not very important	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
o. I tell someone, specify _____	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM

(78)82. After a physical fight when things have cooled down, husband react in many different ways towards their wives. What is your husband's usual reaction?

a. He feels sorry that he hit you	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
b. He verbally apologizes to you	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
c. He promises never to hit you again	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
d. He brings you gifts/money to compensate	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
e. He acts as though nothing has happened	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
f. He blames you for the violence	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
g. He gives you reasons for the violence	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
h. Any other, specify _____	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM

(79)83. Do you know why he hits you?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

(80)84. What are the reasons he gives you for the physical assault? Please specify.

(81)85. What do *you* think are the reasons for the physical assaults? Please specify.

Wrapping Session

Request for 2nd Interview:

As I had explained earlier, I would like to have a second interview with you to ask you more detailed questions about marital violence. Please let me know at this juncture whether you might want to have a second interview with me. The second interview will take no more than 1 to 1½ hours to complete. As with this interview, the answers to the questions will remain confidential and all identifying information will be taken out.

If Yes, Please indicate the most convenient and safest time and place to meet:

If No, go to:

Concluding Remarks:

I would like to thank you for your participation in this study. The data collected during these interviews will contribute to a better understanding of women's lives in marriages in India and will be used to further women's happiness and satisfaction in their marital lives. Please remember that any data pertaining to yourself as an individual participant will be kept confidential. If you would like a summary of the results of the project, please do not hesitate to contact me in the address given to you in the beginning of the interview. When the study is completed, I will send the necessary information to you. Again, thank you for your time and cooperation.

APPENDIX B: SECOND FIELDWORK INTERVIEW

SECOND INTERVIEW

Health

First Interview	
Case ID#:	_____
Sample ID#:	_____
Date:	_____
Start Time:	_____
End Time:	_____
Interview #	_____

1. The following questions are in regards to some of the ways in which people feel and act. Please tell me how often in the past week have you felt....

Full of Energy

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

Very Nervous

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

Felt so down that nothing could cheer you up

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

Felt downhearted and blue

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

Felt tired

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

Felt Happy

- 00 Never
- 01 Rarely
- 02 Some of the time
- 03 Most of the time
- 04 All of the time

2. I am going to read a list of difficulties people sometimes have after stressful life events. Thinking about the violence you have experienced, please tell me how much these difficulties bothered you in the last week.

	Not at all	A little bit	Moderately	Quite a bit	Don't know
I had trouble falling asleep	00	01	02	03	04
Any reminder of the violence brought back feelings	00	01	02	03	04
I had trouble staying asleep					
Other things kept making me think about it	00	01	02	03	04
I felt irritable and angry	00	01	02	03	04
I avoided letting myself get upset when I thought about it	00	01	02	03	04
I thought about it when I didn't mean to	00	01	02	03	04
It felt it hadn't happened or wasn't real	00	01	02	03	04
I stayed away from reminders about it	00	01	02	03	04
Pictures of it popped into my mind	00	01	02	03	04
I was jumpy and easily startled	00	01	02	03	04
I tried not to think about it	00	01	02	03	04
I was aware that I had feelings but I didn't deal with them	00	01	02	03	04
My feelings about it were numb	00	01	02	03	04
I found myself acting or feeling like I was back at that time	00	01	02	03	04
I had waves of strong feelings	00	01	02	03	04
I had trouble concentrating	00	01	02	03	04
Reminders of it caused me to have physical reactions, such as trouble breathing, or nausea	00	01	02	03	04
I had dreams about it	00	01	02	03	04
I felt watchful and on guard	00	01	02	03	04

3. (Injury Scale) How often have you sustained the following type of injuries after a physical altercation with your husband?

	Never	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20
Head or brain injury	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Spinal cord injury	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Broken bones, dislocated joints	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Burns, rug burns	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Never	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20
Lacerations, knife wounds, stitches	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Scratches, black eye, bite marks	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Internal injuries	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Chipped or knocked out teeth	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Miscarriage, complication of pregnancy	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sore muscles, sprains, pulls	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Bleeding genitals, and genital injuries	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Perforated or shattered eardrums	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Knocked unconscious	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Other Specify _____	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Did you ever receive medical care for the injuries caused by your husband from:

Neighbours	00 No	01 Yes
Friends	00 No	01 Yes
Family Members	00 No	01 Yes
Family Doctor	00 No	01 Yes
Homeopathic/Ayurvedic Doctor	00 No	01 Yes
Hospital		
Inpatient	00 No	01 Yes
Outpatient	00 No	01 Yes
Outpatient Clinic/ER	00 No	01 Yes

5. In response to the violence that you experience from your husband, have you ever thought of committing suicide?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

6. In response to the violence that you experience from your husband, have you ever attempted to commit suicide?

- 00 No
- 01 Yes

Marital Control

7. (Economic control) Thinking about your husband, how often would you say he...

	Never					Always
Disapproves of you working or studying	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tries to prevent you from working or studying	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feels it is necessary to have control over money	1	2	3	4	5	6
Requires you to ask him for money	1	2	3	4	5	6
Has full knowledge of family income and expenses	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. (Control through threats) Thinking about your husband, how often would you say he...

Never Always

Threatens to do something to harm you	1	2	3	4	5	6
Threatens to leave you or commit suicide	1	2	3	4	5	6
Threatens to report you to the police/authorities	1	2	3	4	5	6
Encourages you to do illegal things you would not otherwise do	1	2	3	4	5	6

9. (Control through intimidation) Thinking about your husband, how often would you say he....

	Never					Always
Looks at you angrily or does something that makes you think he is angry at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
Makes you afraid when the above is done	1	2	3	4	5	6
Smashes property when annoyed/angry	1	2	3	4	5	6
Vents anger on household pets	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. (Emotional Control) Thinking about your husband how often would you say he....

	Never					Always
Puts you down in front of others	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tries to humiliate you in front of others	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tells you that you are (acting) crazy	1	2	3	4	5	6
Calls you unpleasant names	1	2	3	4	5	6

11. (Control through Isolation) Thinking about your husband, how often would you say he....

	Never					Always
Restricts the amount of time you spend with friends	1	2	3	4	5	6
family	1	2	3	4	5	6
Wants to know where you are at all times	1	2	3	4	5	6
Limits your activities outside of the relationship	1	2	3	4	5	6
Feels suspicious of you	1	2	3	4	5	6

Restrictions and Justifiable Control

12. Women think that there are certain restrictions that a husband can rightfully make on his wife and there are other restrictions that a husband cannot make on his wife. Given your answers to the above questions, what do you think of the restrictions or controlling behaviors of your husband?

Probe: Do you think that in certain cases, these restrictions and controlling behaviors are justifiable?

Probe: Do you think you are responsible for his controlling behaviors?

Probe: Have these controlling behaviors escalated or decreased over the duration of your marriage?

Probe: What do you do in response to these controlling behaviors? Do you do what he asks you to say? Do you resist doing what he wants you to do? Are there certain issues that you do what he says and other issues that you do not do what he says?

Probe: Typically, how does he react when you do not respond to his controlling behaviors? Are there certain issues that he is particular about and other issues when he backs down when you resist?

Probe: How do your other family members react when you resist your husband's restrictions, and how do your other family members react when you do what your husband wants you to do?

Probe: What do you feel about these restrictions?

13. When was the last violent episode with your husband?

- 00 Last Week
- 01 15 days ago
- 02 A month ago
- 03 3 months
- 04 6 months
- 05 A year
- 06 Several years

Immediate Reactions to Violence

14. Think of an example of a violent incident. Take us through what happens before, during and after the violent episode: A narration of the incident either of the first, worst, or the most memorable incident.

Probe: When did this incident happen? Was it immediately after marriage....

Probe: After a violent episode, what are your immediate reactions to the violence?

Probe: Do you usually become submissive, till his anger cools down?

Probe: Is that useful to cool the situation?

Probe: Do you usually become confrontational?

Probe: Under what circumstances do you become submissive or confrontational?

Probe: Are you aware of any clues that you get to behave either submissively or confrontationally?

Probe: What are the usual results of becoming confrontational? Is the violence likely to increase or decrease? What are the usual results of becoming submissive? Is the violence likely to increase or decrease?

Probe: Do you wait out the violence and confront him later when he has cooled down?

Probe: What are the usual results of this strategy?

Probe: If you are always submissive or always confrontational, then what do you think are the benefits of the approach?

Probe: What will happen if you choose another approach?

Reasons for Violence (Given and Believed)

15. Sometimes when husbands have problems with their wives, the physical violence is usually centered around a single thing. Sometimes, husbands might hit their wives without warning or reason. During the course of your marriage, did you ever feel that you understood why he was violent?

Probe: What are the usual reasons that your husband uses to abuse you?

Probe: Do you think these reasons are valid? If Yes, how valid are they? If No, why do you think they are not valid?

Probe: Do you think that the reasons that your husband gives you are the real reasons for the physical violence?

Probe: What do *you* think are the reasons that your husband abuses you?

Probe: How do you know that these are the things that provoke any incidents of violence?

Probe: Do you think these reasons are valid? If Yes, how valid are they? If No, why do you think they are not valid?

Probe: If you think there are certain problem areas, do you see yourself avoiding these 'sensitive' topics that will trigger the violence?

Probe: Is this strategy successful? Under what circumstances does it succeed? Under what circumstances does it fail?

Patterns and History of Violence

16. Violence changes in the course of a duration. Sometimes it gets worse, and sometimes it reduces. Looking back on your relationship, what do you think has changed in the course of your marriage with regards to the violence?

Probe: Can you see any emotional or physical changes in the experience of violence from the first time he hit you till the most recent incident?

Probe: If Yes, in what ways has the violence changed?

Probe: Has the type of violence changed in its type, form, intensity, and the reasons given to you?

Probe: If No, do you think it is likely to reduce in any foreseeable future?

Probe: Do you think there is something you can do to change the violence?

Probe: In what ways do you think you want your relationship to change?

Probe: How much hope do you have that things will change?

Sexual Assault

17. (Sexual Assault Scale) How often has your husband done the following to you?

	Never	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	>20
Insisted on sex even though I did not want to, but no force	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Used force (hitting, holding down, weapon) to have sex	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Used threats to have sex	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Money and Violence

18. Some husbands beat their wives because of money problems, with regards to dowry or his leisure money. Has your husband ever hit you because of money?

- Probe: Has it been because he didn't get the money he needed for his purchases?
- Probe: Has it been because you asked him for money for you or your household expenses?
- Probe: Do you save money to avoid any excuse for physical abuse? How useful do you think the strategy is for leaving or staying in the relationship? Can you describe an instance where this was useful/ harmful to you?
- Probe: If you have ever thought of leaving the relationship temporarily or permanently, do you save money in such cases? How useful do you think is this strategy? Can you describe an instance where this was useful/ harmful to you?
- Probe: Do you save money without him knowing so that you are not totally dependent on him? How useful do you think is this strategy? Can you describe an instance where this was useful/ harmful to you?
- Probe: If you work, do you tend to store some money away in case of an emergency? How useful do you think is this strategy? Can you describe an instance where this was useful/ harmful to you?
- Probe: Do you manage to earn enough money without your husband's knowledge? How useful do you think is this strategy? Can you describe an instance where this was useful/ harmful to you?

Impact on Children

19. Most of the time, violence happen within closed doors, but children are sometimes used or witness violence in the house. I want to ask a few questions regarding the domestic violence and children.

Probe: Do you think children should know that their father is physically abusing their mother?

Probe: Do you think your children know about the violence in your family?

Probe: If Yes, what do you feel about it?

Probe: If No, what strategies do you take to make sure that children do not find out?

Probe: Does your husband ever involve children in the physical fights?

Probe: What strategies do you adopt to protect your children from your husband's violence?

Probe: Do your children protect you from your husband's violence?

Probe: In the case where children try to protect you from your husband's violence, is your husband ever violent towards your children?

Probe: If yes, what strategies do you adopt to protect your children from your husband's violence?

Probe: What do you think are going to be the long-term effects on the children regarding the violence they experience or the violence that they witness?

Probe: Ideally, what would you like to do for your children during a violent episode on the children or the woman?

Probe: Do you think your children have become more violent after your husband has started beating you?

Leaving Behavior

20. Did you ever leave your husband because he was violent towards you?

00 No

01 Yes

21. How many different times did you leave?

_____ Number of times left

22. Where did you stay?

With a friend

00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM

With family members

00 No 01 Vltr 02 Probe 03 NM

With relatives	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
With coworkers	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
With neighbours	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
With Husband's parents/relatives	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
In a Hotel	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
In a Hostel	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
Safe House	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM
I rented a place	00 No	01 Vltr	02 Probe	03 NM

23. What was the main reason that you returned (if she returned)?
- | | | | | |
|---|-------|---------|----------|-------|
| a. Resolved problems | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| b. Counseling worked | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| c. He changed | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| d. I had no money | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| e. I had nowhere to go | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| f. For the sake of the children | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| g. To avoid shame of divorce | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| h. My friends/family could not support me anymore | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| i. I wanted to give him another chance | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| j. I got sick, hurt, disabled | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| k. My family/friends persuaded me to return | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |
| l. Other, Specify _____ | 00 No | 01 Vltr | 02 Probe | 03 NM |

24. After you returned, did your husband's violence towards you....
- | |
|------------------------|
| 00 got much worse |
| 01 got a little worse |
| 02 There was no change |
| 03 got a little better |
| 04 got much better |

Woman's use of Violence

25. Have you ever hit your husband without provocation from your husband?

00 No
01 Yes

26. If yes, what was his response to your violence?

00 Things got much worse
01 Things got a little worse
02 There was no change
03 Helped somewhat
04 Helped a Great deal.

Ending Violence

27. Has your husband's violence towards you stopped?

00 No
01 Yes

28. If Yes, what caused him to stop being violent towards you? Are you afraid that he would be violent again, even though the violence has stopped now?

29. If No, what do you think will cause your husband to stop being violent towards you?

Probe: Do you think removal or stopping some behavior of your husband or the situation will end the violence towards you?

Probe: If you think violence will not be stopped under any circumstances, do you think any changes can be made to reduce the violence on your part?

Organizational Help

30. As we asked in the previous interview, did you ever seek help for problems you were having with your marriage to institutions outside your family?

31. If Yes, Who gave you the best or most helpful response when you were seeking help? What happened during this instance? Please describe what about the response was most useful and helpful to you?

Probe: What was the least helpful or most harmful response you got when seeking help? Who gave you the least helpful or most harmful response when you were seeking help? What happened during this instance? Please describe what about the response was least helpful or most harmful to you?

Probe: If Help not sought from agency, when why not, describe in detail?

Probe: What do you think are the services that women's agencies, or the police should provide to help women who are in crisis?

Probe: If Help sought from agency, then How effective do you think are the services of service agencies (women's organization or police or social workers)

Probe: What do you think are the specific areas of help that can be improved upon?

Concluding Remarks:

I would like to thank you for your participation in this study. The data collected during these interviews will contribute to a better understanding of women's lives in marriages in India and will be used to further women's happiness and satisfaction in their marital lives. Please remember that any data pertaining to yourself as an individual participant will be kept confidential. If you would like a summary of the results of the project, please contact the agency, since we will be providing a copy of our results to them. Again, thank you for your time and cooperation.

Niveditha Menon

“Sharanya”, Plot No. 29 Saipuri Colony, Sainikpuri (P.O.), Secunderabad, AP 500 094

Phone (Home): (040) 2711 3020, Email: menon.niveditha@gmail.com

Education

2008 Ph.D. (Sociology and Demography), Pennsylvania State University, USA
2003 M. A. (Sociology), Pennsylvania State University, USA
2001 B.A (Psychology), Rutgers University, USA
1999 B.Com (Honors), St. Francis' College for Women, India.

Professional Interests

Gender, Domestic and Sexual violence, Women's empowerment, Education, Case counseling, and Community development.

Community Experience

1996 – 1999 Volunteer, National Service Scheme, Hyderabad, India
2001 – 2008 Certified Counselor and Volunteer, Centre County Women's Center, State College, USA
2001 – 2008 President and Secretary, Women's Studies Graduate Organization, State College, USA
2002 – 2004 Member, Minority Opportunities School Transformation Committee, State College, USA
2003 – 2008 Co-founder and Member, Association for South Asia Research, State College, USA
2007 – 2008 Member, Central Pennsylvania Community Housing Cooperative, State College, USA

Grants and Awards

2006 Women's Studies Graduate Teaching Award (\$750)
2006 Crawford Family Fellowship for Ethical Inquiry (\$16,000)
2006 Humanities Initiative Dissertation Fellow (\$1000)
2005 Graduate Student Dissertation Support Grant (\$1000)
2001 Laurie Ann McDade Fellowship (\$2000)

Research Experience

2006 Principal Investigator, Dissertation field research in Pune, India
2004 – 2005 Research Assistant, Dr. Valarie King, Penn State University, USA
2001 – 2004 Research Assistant, Dr. Michael P. Johnson, Penn State University, USA

Publications

Menon, N. & Johnson, M. P. (2007). “Patriarchy and paternalism in intimate partner violence: A study of domestic violence in rural India.” In Kamal Misra and Janet Lowry (Ed.), *Current Research on Women in India*, Rawat Publications, New Delhi, India.

Menon, N.(forthcoming). “Feminist methodology in practice: Collecting data on domestic violence in India.” Chapter to appear in Sally A. Lloyd, April L. Few, and Katherine R. Allen (Ed.), *Handbook of Feminist Family Studies*, Sage Publications, CA

Teaching Experience

Courses taught at the Undergraduate Level at Pennsylvania State University, USA

2004 – 2008 Sociology of Gender (Instructor)
2005 Racism and Sexism (Co-facilitator)
2004 Family Disorganization (Teaching Assistant)
Introduction to Sociology (Teaching Assistant) Statistics (Instructor)
2001 Intermediate Social Statistics (Teaching Assistant)