



Open Access

**QLANTIC**  
 JOURNAL OF  
 SOCIAL SCIENCES

## Psychological Aspects of Violence against Women: A Quantitative Analysis

Farooq Abdullah <sup>1</sup> Feroz Usmani <sup>2</sup> Muhammad Shoaib <sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** *This paper aims to examine the severity of psychological violence against women in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. A quantitative research design was employed, and a cross-sectional research method was used. A sample of 600 households was determined through the Taro Yamane formula, in which 300 respondents were selected from each rural and urban area on the household level by using a non-probability, convenient sampling technique. For the target population, married women aged 19-61 and above were interviewed through a well-structured quantitative questionnaire designed on a Likert scale. The study concluded that psychological violence against women is found in urban and rural areas in terms of mild and moderate psychological violence, while a high and higher ratio of psychological violence is less likely to be found. Hence, it is argued that psychological violence against women exists in society.*

**Key Words:** Violence, Psychological, Domestic, Women, Household, Family, Finance

### Introduction

The State of Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) is commonly known as Azad Kashmir, a region administered by Pakistan as a self-governing jurisdiction (Akrim, Mahmood, Hussain, & Qasim, 2017; Bird & Vaillancourt, 2008). Azad Kashmir has a total area of 13,297 square kilometers (Department, 2018). AJK is administratively divided into three divisions and ten districts (Department, 2018) with a population of 4.45 million (Reporter, 2017). In this research, psychological violence is determined in Muzaffarabad, the capital of AJK, where the rural and urban population is equally taken to know the severity of the psychological violence against women (PVAW). Previously, few studies were conducted in the domain of domestic violence. Ali (2017) revealed that the physical violence against women is due to the financial issues in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. Similar findings have been revealed by the author (0000) that physical violence prevails on a small scale in Muzaffarabad. Similarly, Rashid and Chauhan (2015) also unveiled that the VAW prevails in AJK and remains unreported. As far as the phenomenon of domestic violence is concerned, research shows that domestic violence is accustomed to the web of society across the globe (Macintyre, 2012; Paudel, 2007). It has been observed globally that women are more likely to be victims of domestic violence (Schneider & Carroll, 2020). Women are an integral part of society, living in a masculine structure and experiencing male dominance in almost all walks of life (Simons & Morgan, 2018). Seemingly, domestic violence manifests various forms that differ from region to region and, hence, from society to society. A large body of literature shows that besides physical violence, psychological violence is more likely prevalent across the globe (Gordon, 2017; Hagemann-White, 2008; HRCP, 2018; Kedir & Admasachew, 2010).

### Objective and Hypothesis

The main objective of this study is to examine the severity of psychological violence in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. Moreover, the study hypothesis is that psychological violence is more likely associated with the education of respondents, in-laws, and husbands, the number of children and the

<sup>1</sup> Lecturer, Department of Sociology, Mirpur University of Science and Technology (MUST), Mirpur, AJ&K, Pakistan.

<sup>2</sup> District Probation Officer, District Courts Sialkot, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan.

<sup>3</sup> Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Punjab, Pakistan.



number of females and children in arranged marriages, low income, endogamy, joint family systems, and lower status of the husband.

## Review of Literature

In developed countries, research work reveals that violence is mainly found among housewives [women] in different forms, while women in developing countries also face similar nature of violence (Hagemann-White, 2008; Kocacik, Kutlar, & Erselcan, 2007; Liu & Fullerton, 2015; Raghavendra, Duvvury, & Ashe, 2017; Tam, Dawson, Jackson, Kwok, & Thurston, 2013). Though physical violence has enduring impacts on the lives of women (Author, 0000), psychological violence against women also persists worldwide while leaving lasting impacts on the lives of women, either housewives or working women (Ali, 2017; Lewis, Rowe, & Wiper, 2017). Moreover, different other factors have been noticed that contribute to the prevalence of domestic violence in general and psychological violence in particular (Vetten, 2016). For example, the imbalance in the education of the partners and families normally causes psychological violence in terms of taunts and dowry issues either by the husband or the in-laws (Bhattacharjee & Banda, 2016). Besides the education of partners, the attitude of in-laws is also the main factor that gives rise to psychological violence against women the world over (Aghtae, 2016). Feminist researchers have witnessed that physical violence is either due to the low education of the husband or wife, which ultimately leads to psychological violence (Keating, 2015), as the low-educated husband abuses the parent of the partner as well. It is further argued that the PVAW may be induced by the pressures of in-laws while taunting the family imbalance and dower.

Similarly, the residence pattern of rural and urban may equally add to the prevalence of psychological violence among the partners owing to the lack of awareness or low educational status of both or one of the partners in urban areas (Flood, 2015; Mavrikiou, Apostolidou, & Parlalis, 2014). Moreover, in most rural areas, psychological violence has also been reported due to the large number of children, where the socialization and education of children are mainly affected due to the low social status of the parents (Macintyre, 2012; Phipps & Smith, 2012). Besides, low-income and large family has a nexus in provoking psychological violence against women. Aftermaths, the socio-economic conditions of the people are the main reason for the psychological violence as low income leads to psychological violence generally in urban areas and particularly in rural areas (Charles, 2011; Kedir & Admasachew, 2010). In different ethnic groups, psychological violence occurs due to the choice of marriages, i.e., arranged and love marriages (Purkayastha & Yousaf, 2018). It is argued psychological violence is due to arranged marriages where the consent of the partners is not taken generally in the traditional setting of society (Keating, 2015). Insofar as the PVAW is reported among the partners experiencing love marriages across the globe. Besides, family types are also found to be the main reasons for the PVAW in developed and developing countries (Macintyre, 2012; Phipps & Smith, 2012). Normally, the joint family structure is still found in most of the developing countries (Charles, 2011; Kedir & Admasachew, 2010). The research revealed that violence erupts due to either low income or a large number of children and marriages against the will of both partners in a joint family system. Besides, social status is very important to know the causes of PVAW in most of the developing countries. It has been observed that lower social status mainly causes violence, either physical or psychological, while in some cases, high social status may also cause psychological violence.

## Materials and Methods

The research was conducted in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad to know the prevalence of psychological violence among women (PVAW) housewives working at home. The objective of the study was to examine the psychological violence against women in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. In this study, a quantitative research design was used, and a cross-sectional research method was employed to determine the relationship among the variables. The data was collected from the rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. For this, three wards of urban areas were selected, and similarly, the three villages from the rural areas were selected for the study. From the target population, a sample of 600 respondents was selected from the urban and rural areas (300 each) through the purpose sampling technique. The respondents were selected based on some characteristics, i.e., being married, having at least one child, and

facing psychological violence. Similarly, psychological violence is commuted through 13 variables of psychological violence, i.e., cursing the partner, taunting, dowry, in-laws taunts, insult, relations, belongings, allowing a partner to see parents, financial matters, basic needs, monitoring time, sexual assault. On the other hand, the demographic variables such as education of respondents and husbands, in-laws, residence, marriage type, family structure, income, and social status were tested against the dependent variable of commuted variables of psychological violence. Moreover, the data was collected through a well-designed close-ended questionnaire designed on a Likert Scale comprising 41 items. The data was collected and edited to remove the omissions. Thus, the data was finally converted to Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12 and analyzed by employing the Chi-Square test. Hence, the results are displayed in the form of tables and elaborated to a conclusion.

### Results and Discussions

The above table shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents involved in the study in Muzaffarabad, Azad Jammu, and Kashmir. The education status of the respondents is interpreted as 33 percent were found illiterate, 39.5 percent had education up to matric, 10.8 percent had bachelor's degrees, and 4.5 percent possessed master's degrees and above. Similarly, the education of husbands is found as 21.2 percent illiterate, 45.8 percent having education up to matric, 14.3 percent having intermediate education, 12.8 percent having bachelor degree, and 5.9 percent having master's degrees and above education level as the 300 respondents are equally taken from the rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. Here, we found the income status of the respondents as 46.8 percent earn less than 10,000 per month, 29.8 percent earn more than 20,000 and less than 30,000, and 12.8 percent earn 30,000 per month while 10.5 percent earn more than 40000 per month.

**Table 1**  
Distribution of demographic characteristics of the respondents

Education of Respondent	Frequency	Percent	Residence	Frequency	Percent
Illiterate	200	33.3	Rural	300	50.0
Up to Matric	239	39.5	Urban	300	50.0
Bachelor	65	10.8	<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Masters and Above	27	04.5	<b>Income (PKR)</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>	Less than 10000	281	46.8
<b>Education of Husband</b>			10001 - 20000	179	29.8
Illiterate	127	21.2	20001 - 30000	77	12.8
Up to Matric	275	45.8	Above 30001	63	10.5
Intermediate	86	14.3	<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Bachelor	77	12.8	<b>Marriage Method</b>		
Masters and Above	35	05.9	Love	77	12.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>	Arrange	523	87.2
<b>No of Children</b>			<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>
1-2	185	30.8	<b>Marriage Type</b>		
3-4	208	34.7	Endogamy	380	63.3
5-6	102	17.0	Exogamy	220	36.7
7 & Above	58	09.7	<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>
None of the above	47	07.8	<b>Family System</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>	Joint	435	72.5
<b>Sex of Children</b>			Nuclear	165	27.5
Male	86	14.3	<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Female	94	15.7	<b>Social Status</b>		
Both above	373	62.2	Same	487	81.2
None of the above	47	07.8	Fluctuating	113	18.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>600</b>	<b>100.0</b>

As far as the number of children is concerned, 30.8 percent had 1-2 children, 34.7 percent had 3-4 children, 17 percent had 5-6 children, 9.7 percent had more than seven children, whereas 7.8 percent had no children



over a long period. Similarly, 14.3 percent of respondents had only male children, 15.7 percent had female children, 62.2 percent had both male and female children, and 7.8 percent had no children. When the respondents inquired about their marriage, only 12.8 percent knotted through love marriages, and 87.2 percent were bonded through arranged marriages. Similarly, exogamy is less likely found as only 36.7 percent while 63.3 percent experienced endogamy. In extension to marriages and marriage types, a majority of respondents, 72.5 percent, belonged to the joint family system, and 27.5 percent were living in the nuclear family system. This shows that the respondents are still practicing the traditional system of marriages and living patterns while nuclear families are still discouraged. In the end, the social status of the respondents and their partners was necessary to determine as 81.2 percent were found to be of the same status, while 18.8 percent of respondents [women] had either a higher or lower status than their husbands.

The psychological violence among 600 sample size is described as among 33.3 percent of illiterate respondents, 0.2 percent did not face any violence, 30.7 percent faced mild, and 2.5 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents had a primary level of education (9.5 percent, in which 8.8 percent faced mild violence, and 0.7 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents having a middle level of education were found to be 8.8 percent, of which 8.2 percent faced mild violence and 0.7 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents having matric levels of education were found to be 21.5 percent, of which 19.2 percent faced mild violence and 2.3 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents having an intermediate level of education were found to be 11.5 percent, of which 10.2 percent faced mild violence and 1.3 percent faced moderate violence. Of the respondents having a bachelor's level of education, 10.8 percent were found, in which 8.8 percent faced mild violence, 2 percent faced moderate violence, and at the master's level, 4.5 percent faced mild violence. The greater ratio of violence is 33.1 percent reported by illiterate respondents. Out of 600 respondents, violence was determined by intrigue based on in-laws' education. Respondents whose in-laws are not educated were found to be 31.8 percent, of which 0.2 percent did not face any psychological violence, 29.5 percent faced mild violence, and 2.2 percent faced moderate psychological violence. Of the respondents whose in-laws are educated, 29.5 percent were found, of which 25.2 percent faced mild psychological violence and 4.3 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents whose in-laws are mostly educated were found to be 25.7 percent, of which 23.8 percent faced mild violence and 1.8 percent faced moderate violence. Mild and moderate violence was found to a great extent, 90.3 percent and 9.3 percent, respectively. The greater ratio of violence was found in the first category.

Similarly, 31.6 percent of respondents reported violence because of illiterate in-laws. The data indicate that the illiterate respondents were found to be 21.2 percent, of which 0.2 percent did not face any violence, 18.7 percent faced mild violence, and 28.2 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents who had a primary level of education were found to be 3.7 percent, of which 3.5 percent faced mild violence and 0.2 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents whose education level was middle were found to be 10.5 percent, of which 8.8 percent faced mild violence and 1.7 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having matric levels of education were found to be 31.7 percent, of which 29.7 percent faced mild violence, and 2 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents having an intermediate level of education were found to be 14.3 percent, of which 12.5 percent faced mild violence and 1.8 percent faced moderate psychological violence. The respondents having a bachelor's level of education were found to be 12.8 percent, of which 11.5 percent faced mild violence and 1.3 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents had a master's level of education, and others were found to be 5.8 percent, of which 5.7 percent faced mild violence and 0.2 percent faced moderate violence. The greater ratio of p violence was faced by 31.7 percent of respondents falling in the illiterate category.

Respondents having 1-2 children were found to be 30.8 percent, of which 0.2 percent faced no violence, 27.8 percent faced mild violence, and 2.8 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having 3-4 children were found to be 34.7 percent, of which 31.2 percent faced mild violence, and 3.5 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having 5-6 children were 17 percent, of which 15.3 percent faced no violence, and 1.7 percent faced mild violence. Respondents having seven and above children were found to be 9.7 percent, of which 8.5 percent faced mild l violence, and 1.2 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having no children were found to be 7.8 percent, of which 7.5 percent faced mild violence and 0.3 percent faced moderate violence. Thus, 34.7 percent of women having 3-4 children faced violence.

The data explains the violence according to the sex of children. Respondents having male children were found to be 14.3 percent, of which 13 percent faced mild violence and 1.3 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having female children were 15.7 percent, of which 13.5 percent faced mild violence, and 2.2 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having both male and female children were 62.2 percent, of which 0.2 percent faced no violence, 56.5 percent faced mild violence, and 5.5 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having no children were found to be 7.8 percent, of which 7.3 percent faced mild violence and 0.5 percent faced moderate psychological violence. Hence, 62 percent of women having children of both sexes face violence. The ratio of violence is greater in the category of having both male and female children.

Data in the table indicate that among the 50 percent of respondents in rural areas, 0.2 percent faced no violence, 47.5 percent faced mild violence, and 2.3 percent faced moderate violence, whereas among the 50 percent of respondents in the urban area, 42.8 percent faced mild violence, 7.2 percent faced moderate violence. The ratio of violence is greater in urban areas as compared to rural areas.

**Table 2a**  
Responses regarding psychological violence against women in Muzaffarabad

Education of the respondents					
Category	No-Violence	Mild	Moderate	High	Total
Illiterate	01 (0.2%)	184 (30.7%)	15 (02.5%)	00	200 (33.3%)
Primary	00	53 (08.8%)	03 (00.5%)	01 (00.2%)	57 (09.5%)
Middle	00	49 (08.2%)	04 (00.7%)	00	53 (08.8%)
Matric	00	115 (19.2%)	14 (02.3%)	00	129 (21.5%)
Intermediate	00	61 (10.2%)	08 (01.3%)	00	69 (11.5%)
Bachelor	00	53 (08.8%)	12 (02.0%)	00	65 (10.8%)
Masters	00	27 (04.5%)	00	00	27 (04.5%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01(00.2%)	600 (100%)
In-laws Education					
No	01 (0.2%)	177 (29.5%)	12 (02.0%)	01 (00.2%)	191 (31.8%)
Some	0	151 (25.2%)	26 (04.3%)	00	177 (29.5%)
Mostly	0	143 (23.8%)	11 (01.8%)	00	154 (25.7%)
All	0	71 (11.8%)	07 (01.2%)	00	78 (13.0%)
Total	1(0.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
Education of Husband					
Illiterate	01 (0.2%)	112 (18.7%)	13 (02.2%)	01 (00.2%)	127 (21.2%)
Primary	00	21 (03.5%)	01 (00.2%)	00	22 (03.7%)
Middle	00	53 (08.8%)	10 (01.7%)	00	63 (10.5%)
Matric	00	178 (29.7%)	12 (02%)	00	190 (31.7%)
Intermediate	00	75 (12.5%)	11 (01.8%)	00	86 (14.3%)
Bachelor	00	69 (11.5%)	08 (01.3%)	00	77 (12.8%)
Masters & others	00	340 (05.7%)	010 (0.2%)	00	34 (05.9%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
No of Children					
1-2	01 (00.2%)	167 (27.8%)	17 (02.8%)	00	185 (30.8%)
3-4	00	187 (31.2%)	21 (03.5%)	00	208(34.7%)
5-6	00	92 (15.3%)	09 (01.5%)	01 (00.2%)	102 (17.0%)
7 & Above	00	51 (08.5%)	07 (01.2%)	00	58 (09.7%)
None of the above	00	45 (07.5%)	02 (00.3%)	00	47 (07.9%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
Sex of Children					
Male	00	78 (13%)	08 (01.3%)	00	86 (14.3%)
Female	00	81 (13.5%)	13 (02.2%)	00	94 (15.7%)
Both of the above	01 (00.2%)	339 (56.5%)	32 (05.3%)	01 (00.2%)	373 (62.2%)
None of the above	00	44 (07.3%)	03 (00.5%)	00	47 (07.8%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (9.3%)	01(00.2%)	600 (100%)



The level of violence according to the income of the respondents: among the 600 respondents, 46.8 percent whose income is less than 10,000, 0.2 percent faced no violence, 43.5 percent faced mild violence, and 3.2 percent faced moderate psychological violence. Respondents having an income of more than 20000 were found to be 29.8 percent, of which 26.5 percent faced mild violence, and 3.3 percent faced moderate violence. The respondents having income under 30000 were found to be 12.8 percent, in which 11.7 percent faced mild violence, and 1.2 percent faced moderate violence, whereas respondents having more than 40000 income were found to be 10.5 percent in which 8.7 percent faced mild violence, and 1.8 percent faced moderate violence. Violence is faced by 46.6 percent of respondents whose income is less than 10,000.

Out of 600 sample size, 12.8 percent of respondents had a love marriage in which 10.5 percent faced mild violence, 2.2 percent faced moderate violence, and 0.2 percent faced high violence, whereas 87.2 percent of respondents having arranged marriages were found in which 0.2 percent faced no violence, 79.8 percent faced mild violence, and 7.2 percent faced moderate violence. The violence faced by the respondents having arranged marriages is quite large. As 87 percent of women having arranged marriages faced violence, 99.8 percent.

Of the respondents having endogamy, 63.3 percent, 0.2 percent faced no violence, 59.2 percent faced mild violence, and 4 percent faced moderate violence, whereas respondents having exogamy were 36.7 percent which 31.2 percent faced mild violence, 5.3 percent faced moderate violence, and 0.2 percent faced high violence. Thus, 63.1 percent of women having endogamy faced violence among 99.8 percent.

Data in the table illustrate the violence among the respondents according to the family system. Respondents having a joint family system were 71.2 percent, a large proportion in which 0.2 percent faced no violence, 64 percent faced mild violence, 0.2 percent faced high violence, and 6.8 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having extended family systems were found to be 1.5 percent, of which 1.2 percent faced mild psychological violence, and 0.3 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having a nuclear family system were found to be 27.3 percent, of which 25.2 percent faced mild violence and 2.2 percent faced moderate violence. The proportion of violence is higher at 71.2 percent in the joint family system. The greater ratio of violence, 71 percent, falls in the joint family system.

**Table 2b**

*Responses regarding psychological violence against women in Muzaffarabad*

<b>Residence</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>No-Violence</b>	<b>Mild</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Total</b>
Rural	01 (00.2%)	285 (47.5%)	14 (02.3%)	0	300 (50%)
Urban	00	257 (42.8%)	42 (07%)	01 (00.2%)	300 (50%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
<b>Income of the Family</b>					
Less than 10000	01 (00.2%)	261(43.5%)	18 (03.0%)	01 (00.2%)	281 (46.8%)
10001 - 20000	00	159 (26.5%)	20 (03.3%)	0	179 (29.3%)
20001 - 30000	00	70 (11.7%)	07 (01.2%)	0	77 (12.8%)
Above 30001	00	52 (08.7%)	11 (01.8%)	0	63 (100.5%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	560 (9.3%)	001 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
<b>How Married</b>					
Love	00	63 (10.5%)	13 (02.2%)	01 (00.2%)	77 (12.8%)
Arrange	01 (0.2%)	479 (79.8%)	43 (07.2%)	0	523 (87.2%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
<b>Marriage Type</b>					
Endogamy	01 (00.2%)	355 (59.2%)	24 (04.0%)	0	380 (63.3%)
Exogamy	00	187 (31.2%)	32 (05.3%)	01(00.2%)	220 (36.7%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01(00.2%)	600 (100%)
<b>Family System</b>					
Joint	01 (00.2%)	384 (64%)	41(6.8%)	01 (00.2%)	427 (71.2%)

Extended	00	07 (01.2%)	02 (00.3%)	00	09 (01.5%)
Nuclear& others	00	151 (25.2%)	13 (2.2%)	00	164 (27.3%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (9.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)
<b>Social Status</b>					
Same	01 (00.2%)	449 (74.8%)	37 (06.2%)	00	487 (81.2%)
High	00	34 (05.7%)	05 (00.8%)	01 (00.2%)	40 (6.7%)
Low	00	56 (09.3%)	14 (02.3%)	00	70 (11.7%)
Others	00	03 (00.5%)	00	00	03 (00.5%)
Total	01 (00.2%)	542 (90.3%)	56 (09.3%)	01 (00.2%)	600 (100%)

The depicted data demonstrates that 81.2 percent of respondents had the same social status in which 0.2 percent faced no violence, 74.8 percent faced mild violence, and 6.2 percent faced moderate violence. Respondents having high social status were found to be 6.7 percent, of which 5.7 percent faced mild violence, 0.8 percent faced moderate violence, and 0.2 percent faced high violence. Respondents having low social status were found to be 11.7 percent, in which 9.3 percent faced mild violence and 2.3 percent faced moderate violence, whereas respondents having social status other than above were found 0.5 percent and faced mild psychological violence. The ratio of violence is higher in the same social status. Hence, 81 percent of women from the same social status were found to be victims of violence.

### Hypothesis Testing

The association of violence against women with the demographic variables has been tested and portrayed in the above table. Psychological violence is based on the commuted variables showing psychological violence. According to the results, it is evident that violence is significantly associated with the demographic variables. The values shown in the table unveil that psychological violence against women exists as the “crush by the partner on parents” is significantly associated with the demographic variables. Similarly, the dowry issues persist, and it is also significant, showing that violence occurs due to dowry issues. Similarly, the taunting of the in-laws is highly significant, illustrating the association with violence. However, the insult in front of others is also a significant delineated association. Moreover, the relations of the husband with other women and harming the belongings of the partner [wife] are highly significant and show a strong association. The partner's [husband] permission to visit the home of the parents is significantly associated, while the financial matters are highly significant, magnifying the strong relationship with psychological violence. Furthermore, fulfilling the needs of partners is also significant, showing that violence is mainly due to not fulfilling the needs of the partners. In the same fashion, the monitoring of time by the male partner also provokes violence while indicating a significant p-value. Also, the sexual assault from the partner and in-laws is significantly associated, revealing the existence of the violence.

**Table 3**

Association of psychological violence against women with demographic variables

	Psychological Violence	Chi-Square	df	P-Value
Demographic Variables	Does your partner curse your parents?	23.476	18	0.000
	Does your partner taunt you due to dower?	13.152	9	0.004
	Does your partner insult you in front of others?	16.527	21	0.005
	Does your partner have relations with other women?	9.244	12	0.000
	Does your partner harm your belongings?	4.169	9	0.000
	Does your partner not allow you to see your parents?	17.446	3	0.001
	Does your partner quarrel with you on financial matters?	10.637	9	0.000
	Does your partner fulfill your basic needs?	13.043	3	0.005
	Does your partner monitor your time?	13.511	3	0.004
	Do your in-laws also taunt you due to dower?	3.669	9	0.000
	Does your partner assault you sexually?	26.219	9	0.002
	Does any other form of in-laws assault you sexually?	11.342	9	0.000



## Discussions

Research across the globe reveals that psychological violence occurs in family life (Lau & Stevens, 2010). This PVAW consistently occurs due to several factors and mainly depends upon the nature of the community and society (Leidig, 1992). In developed countries, PVAW has been well searched while the voices raised against the indifferent treatment of women at home by the partners (Schneider & Carroll, 2020; UNESCO, 2020; Wariyatun, 2019). Resultantly, the laws amended and developed against such discriminatory behavior of male partners against the wives, and several developments also took place under the feminist perspective to protect women from gender discrimination (Asavei, 2019; Simons & Morgan, 2018). Unlike the developed countries, the situation in developing countries is still worse, where gender discrimination is prevalent in almost every walk of life, and a large number of cases of domestic violence are reported time and again (Ali, 2017; Janzen, 2018; Singh, Hurley, & Singh, 2017; Vetten, 2016). In domestic violence, physical violence is widespread; similarly, psychological violence is also found and reported in different countries (Bhattacharjee & Banda, 2016). Research shows that psychological violence is found in both rural and urban areas, which endorses findings that the PVAW is found in rural and urban areas of Muzaffarabad. The education of the partners has a vivid impact on the PVAW in both rural and urban areas, where the partners deal with each other according to the social and economic status that determines the PVAW across the globe (Ali, 2017; Vetten, 2016). We found similar results where the male partners discriminate against wives based on social and economic status, and the financial conditions of the husband are critically weaker and exposed to violence in Muzaffarabad. Besides, the taunting of the partner against the dower and familial background are pretty common reasons for violence. Research unveiled that in-laws also promote PVAW on a large scale. Similarly, we found that the in-laws have a great role to invoke the PVAW either taunting the families or socio-economic conditions of the family. It is also observed that the economic conditions of the families are motives of PVAW in society. Here, we also found that the financial conditions of the male partner is critically correlated and gives rise to the violence. Winkvist and Akhtar (2000) argued that a large number of children are a burden to the sole bread earner of the family and in case of failure to provide all the necessities of life, psychological violence is instigated. We also found similar results where a large number of children burden the economy and violence is provoked. Cooper, Anaf, and Bowden (2006) revealed that the marriage types and family structure are also responsible for the PVAW in developing countries, while we reached a similar conclusion that the PVAW is due to either joint family or nuclear family while in endogamy PVAW prevails mainly and remain unreported.

## Conclusion

Psychological violence against women (PVAW) has been reported due to different factors. We covered psychological violence in these categories: no violence, mild violence, moderate violence, and high violence, and we found that mild and moderate violence is mainly found. We found that partners with low education are exposed to violence that gives rise to abuses to the parents of wives by low-educated partners. It is also coupled with the education of in-laws, where the violence is further intensified due to the many issues, i.e., dowry. Similarly, the low socioeconomic status of the male partner and the large number of children also provoke violence against women. Moreover, marriage patterns and family types are also found to be responsible for contributing to psychological violence. It is thus concluded that violence against women is found in urban and rural areas in terms of mild and moderate violence, while a high and higher ratio of psychological violence is less likely to be found.

## References

- Aghtaie, N. (2016). Iranian Women's Perspectives on Violence against Women in Iran and the UK. *Iranian Studies*, 49(4), 593–611. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2015.1017970>.
- Akrim, F., Mahmood, T., Hussain, R., Qasim, S., & Zangi, I. (2017). <b>Distribution pattern, population estimation and threats to the Indian pangolin <I>Manis crassicaudata</I> (Mammalia: Pholidota: Manidae) in and around Pir Lasura National Park, Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Pakistan</b>. *Journal of Threatened Taxa*, 9(3), 9920–9927. <https://doi.org/10.11609/jott.2914.9.3.9920-9927>
- Ali, S. (2017). Women of North Pakistan in the Line of Domestic Violence. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7, 34–38.



- Asavei, M. A. (2019). The art and politics of imagination: Remembering mass violence against women. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 22(5), 618–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230.2019.1565704>
- Bhattacharjee, A., & Banda, S. (2016). Domestic violence against women: The socioeconomic scenario. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 7(7), 765–768. <https://www.ijhscholar.in/index.php/ijhw/article/view/120187>
- Bird, R. M., & Vaillancourt, F. (Eds.). (2008). *Fiscal decentralization in developing countries*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Charles, S. (2011). Obstetricians and violence against women. *The American Journal of Bioethics*, 11(12), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2011.623813>
- Cooper, L., Anaf, J., & Bowden, M. (2006). Contested concepts in violence against women: ‘Intimate’, ‘Domestic’ or ‘Torture’? *Australian Social Work*, 59(3), 314–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03124070600833261>
- Flood, M. (2015). Work with men to end violence against women: A critical stocktake. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 17(sup2), 159–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691058.2015.1070435>
- Gordon, S. F. (2017). Narratives of resistance and resilience: Exploring stories of violence against women. *Agenda*, 31(2), 34–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2017.1366181>
- Hagemann-White, C. (2008). Measuring progress in addressing violence against women across Europe. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 32(2), 149–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2008.9678784>
- Janzen, C. (2018). Safe distances and unbearable closeness: Cliche representations of violence against women in Canada. *Continuum*, 32(6), 808–828. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304312.2018.1515344>
- Keating, B. (2015). Violence against women: A disciplinary debate and challenge. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 56(1), 108–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tsq.12075>
- Kedir, A., & Admasachew, L. (2010). Violence against women in Ethiopia. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 17(4), 437–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369x.2010.485832>
- Kocacik, F., Kutlar, A., & Erselcan, F. (2007). Domestic violence against women: A field study in Turkey. *The Social Science Journal*, 44(4), 687–697. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2007.10.016>
- Lau, U., & Stevens, G. (2010). Exploring the psychological exteriority and interiority of men's violence against women. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 20(4), 623–633. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2010.10820420>
- Leidig, M. W. (1992). The continuum of violence against women: Psychological and physical consequences. *Journal of American College Health*, 40(4), 149–155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.1992.9936276>
- Lewis, R., Rowe, M., & Wiper, C. (2017). Online abuse of feminists as an emerging form of violence against women and girls. *British journal of criminology*, 57(6), 1462–1481. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw073>
- Liu, Y., & Fullerton, T. M. (2015). Evidence from Mexico on social status and violence against women. *Applied Economics*, 47(40), 4260–4274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2015.1026588>
- Macintyre, M. (2012). Confronting violence against women. *Anthropology Now*, 4(2), 102–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19492901.2012.11728366>
- Mavrikiou, P. M., Apostolidou, M., & Parlalis, S. K. (2014). Risk factors for the prevalence of domestic violence against women in Cyprus. *The Social Science Journal*, 51(2), 295–301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2014.02.002>
- Paudel, G. S. (2007). Domestic violence against women in Nepal. *Gender, Technology and Development*, 11(2), 199–233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097185240701100204>
- Phipps, A., & Smith, G. (2012). Violence against women students in the UK: Time to take action. *Gender and Education*, 24(4), 357–373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2011.628928>
- Purkayastha, B., & Yousaf, F. N. (2018). *Human trafficking: trade for sex, labor, and organs*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Raghavendra, S., Duvvury, N., & Ashe, S. (2017). The Macroeconomic Loss due to Violence Against Women: The Case of Vietnam. *Feminist Economics*, 23(4), 62–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2017.1330546>



- Rashid, T., & Chauhan, K. (2015). Violence Against Women (VAW) in Azad Jammu & Kashmir (AJK): Explorations in the Role of Police Department. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 8(11), 43-56. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2709115](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2709115)
- Schneider, P., & Carroll, D. (2020). Conceptualizing more inclusive elections: violence against women in elections and gendered electoral violence. *Policy Studies*, 41(2-3), 172-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2019.1694651>
- Simons, M., & Morgan, J. (2018). Changing Media Coverage of Violence Against Women. *Journalism Studies*, 19(8), 1202-1217. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2016.1266279
- Singh, R. N., Hurley, D., & Singh, D. (2017). Towards identifying and ranking selected types of violence against women in North India. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 41(1-2), 19-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2016.1212246>
- Tam, D. M. Y., Dawson, M., Jackson, M., Kwok, S.-M., & Thurston, W. E. (2013). Comparing criminal justice responses to violence against women in Canada and China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, 23(2), 106-120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02185385.2013.793020>
- UNESCO. (2020). COVID-19 Educational Disruption and Response.
- Vetten, L. (2016). Unintended complicities: preventing violence against women in South Africa. *Gender & Development*, 24(2), 291-306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552074.2016.1194560>
- Wariyatun, W. (2019). Creating zero tolerance for violence against women. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 25(3), 459-467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2019.1638047>
- Winkvist, A., & Akhtar, H. Z. (2000). God should give daughters to rich families only: Attitudes towards childbearing among low-income women in Punjab, Pakistan. *Social Science & Medicine*, 51(1), 73-81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(99\)00440-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00440-2)