Intimate Partner Violence and its Associated Factors among Women of Reproductive Age in Nepal: Findings from a National Cross-Sectional Survey

Shreejana Wagle,¹ Ganesh Pandey,² Bimala Sharma³

¹School of Health and Allied Sciences, Pokhara University, Pokhara, Nepal

²Save the Children, Kathmandu, Nepal

³Community Medicine Department, Gandaki Medical College, Pokhara, Nepal

ABSTRACT

Introduction: In Nepal, Intimate partner violence (IPV) is quite common among women. Several factors can play a role for the incidence of intimate partner violence. The aim of the study was to assess the prevalence of lifetime IPV and last 12 months and associated factors among Nepalese women of reproductive age.

Methods: The Nepal Demographic and Health Survey 2016 data was used for secondary data analysis. In the study, a total of 3,826 women of reproductive age were included. Intimate partner violence was measured as reporting of physical and/or sexual and/or emotional violence ever experienced in her lifetime as well as in the last 12 months. Descriptive statistics, chi-square test, bivariate and multivariate logistic regression were computed.

Results: Overall, 25.7% women have experienced lifetime intimate partner violence, with 22.1% physical, 7.8% sexual and 12.7% emotional violence. Findings from multivariate logistic regression showed that women belonging to lower caste (Adjusted Odds Ratio(AOR):1.41, 95% Cofidence Interval(CI)=1.07-1.85), with no education (AOR:1.95, 95%CI=1.36-2.79), with 3-5 number of children (AOR:1.57,95%CI=1.04-2.35), whose husband had no education (AOR:1.84,95% CI=1.27-2.66), whose husbands drank alcohol (AOR:2.54,95%CI=2.14-3.02) and the women who witness fathers beating their mothers (AOR:2.25,95%CI=1.81-2.78) were more likely suffering from intimate partner violence.

Conclusion: Intimate partner violence has been linked to socio-demographic factors, substance abuse, and previous experience of witnessing fathers beating their mothers. In Nepal, equal access to education for both men and women, prohibition of caste-based discrimination and prevention of substance abuse may be effective strategies for reducing intimate partner violence.

Keywords: Intimate partner violence, Prevalence, Factors, Witnessing violence, Nepal

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence is defined as physical and/or sexual and/or emotional violence perpetrated against a woman of reproductive age (15-49 years) by her husband or partner. 1-3 Violence towards women is a widespread public health problem that has adverse effect on women's physical and mental health.4-5 In Nepal, women are particularly vulnerable to violence. They are subjected to abuse at various stages of their lives. More than half of women said that they had been victims of violence at some point in their lives.⁶ Physical violence was reported by 25.3% of Nepalese women, and sexual violence was reported by 46.2%. Globally, 30% of women in relationship experience either physical or sexual violence or both by their intimate partner in their lifetime.1 The prevalence of IPV ranges from 23.2% in high-income countries to 37.7% in the South-East Asian countries. 1,9 Low educational status,

alcohol use by husbands, witnessing violence during childhood etc. were associated with IPV.^{1-3,7-8,10-12}

A multi country study on intimate partner violence against woman found huge variations in the prevalence of domestic violence with regards to the level of education, socioeconomic status, alcohol abuse, attitudes supportive of wife beating, having outside sexual partners, experiencing childhood abuse, growing up with domestic violence, and experiencing of violence in childhood all contributed to the increased risk of IPV.^{2,10,11}

Correspondence: Shreejana Wagle, School of Health and Allied Sciences, Pokhara University, Pokhara, Nepal, Email: shreejanaw@gmail.com

Many factors might contribute to the occurrence of IPV in Nepal. Women with controlling husband, level of education and having poor mental health were found to be at higher risk of domestic violence.3 Sexual violence within marriage is common in Nepal. Approximately 48.7% of women reported that they were suffering from sexual violence within marriage which ranged from unwanted sexual touch to forced sex. The consequences of sexual violence resulted to backache, headache, lower abdominal pain, vaginal bleeding and thoughts of suicide.13 Among the young women, 46% had experienced sexual violence at some point and 31% had experienced sexual violence within last 12 months by their husband in Nepal. The protective factors against sexual violence were found women's autonomy at the individual and community level and educational level of the husband.8

Although IPV has been experiencing regularly among Nepalese women, most of the literature have focused on domestic violence, 6.8,12,13 there is lack of enough evidences on the factors influencing IPV occurrence and its correlates. Understandings of the factors that influence IPV are needed to address the problem through policy and programs. This study measures IPV as an outcome variable which includes any form of physical violence and/or sexual violence and/or emotional violence by husband or partner. Therefore, this study aimed to assess the prevalence of IPV and its associated factors among women of reproductive age in Nepal.

METHODS

Study design, data and participants

The study utilized the secondary data of Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS), 2016. 14 A publicly available dataset was obtained from the measure DHS website after the written request to DHS. 15 The dataset was created by including relevant information from the women's questionnaire. The NDHS used a multistage cluster sampling procedure for data collection. Each province was stratified into urban and rural areas, yielding 14 sampling strata. Samples of wards were selected independently in each stratum. In the first stage, 383 wards were selected with probability proportional to ward size and in a second stage of sample selection; one enumeration area was randomly selected from each of the sample wards. 14,15

The design of this study was cross sectional. The study population comprised women of age 15-49 years. Total sample size was 4,447. For the measurement of intimate partner violence, 3,826 women of 15-49 years were

included for the analysis after excluding missing. The respondents who did not answer the question of violence were considered as missing. The details of sampling design, sampling frame, questionnaire and procedure can be found in the DHS website and NDHS survey report.¹⁴

Study variables

An outcome variable is IPV that includes any form of physical and/or sexual and/or emotional violence to the women of reproductive age (15-49 years) she ever experienced during her lifetime as well as in the last 12 months by her husband or partner.^{2,3} Occurrence of physical, sexual and/or emotional violence were measured according to the questionnaire of NDHS 2016. There were 13 questions related to emotional, physical, and sexual violence in NDHS regarding IPV.⁸

The physical violence is considered if the respondent experienced any of the act defined as pushed, shook or threw something at her, slapped her, twisted her arm or pulled her hair. Likewise, punched her with his fist or with something that could hurt her, kicked her, dragged her, or beat her up, tried to choke her or burn her on purpose and threatened her or attacked her with a knife, gun, or any other weapon. Whereas sexual violence is considered if the respondent experienced any of the action against her like physically forced her to have sexual intercourse even when she didn't want to or forced her to perform any sexual acts she didn't want to or any degrading or humiliating sexual act. Emotional violence is considered if the respondent perceived that she was humiliated in front of others or threatened to hurt or harm her or someone close to her or insulted her or made her feel bad about herself. Woman who gave a positive response to any of the questions related to physical and/or sexual and/or emotional violence, was considered IPV.14,16

The independent variables are age group, ethnicity, religion, education, occupation, number of children, wealth quintile, ecological zone, developmental region, type of residence, cigarette smoking, respondent's father beat her mother, husband age, husband education level, husband occupation and husband's alcohol consumption. Most of the variables were categorized as they were in the NDHS survey. Ethnicity was categorized into three groups: upper caste (Hill Brahmin, Hill Chhetri, Terai Brahmin, and Terai Chhetri), lower caste (Hill Dalit and Terai Dalit), and others (all other recorded ethnicities). 17,18

Data analysis

The data were analyzed using IBM SPSS version 20.0. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the

characteristics of the study population and to find out the prevalence of IPV in lifetime and in last 12 months. The chi-square (χ^2) test was used to analyze the association between the explanatory variables and IPV in lifetime. Logistic regression was conducted to determine the strength of association of different independent variables with dependent variable i.e., IPV in lifetime. The variables that were significant in the chi-square test were included in the bivariate and multivariate logistic regression. Both crude and adjusted odds ratios were computed at 5% level of significance. Adjusted odds ratios (AORs), 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and p values were presented. Hosmer and Lemeshow Model test was done, and the model was fit for the independent variables in adjusted logistic regression. Nagelkerke R Square was also computed and presented.

The NDHS 2016 was approved by the Nepal Health Research Council and Ethical Review Board of ICF Macro International. Authors got permission from the DHS program to use the dataset for this study.

RESULTS

Prevalence of intimate partner violence

More than a quarter (25.7%) of the respondents experienced IPV, where 22.1% suffered from physical, 7.8% from sexual and 12.7% from emotional violence in their lifetime. Likewise, 13.6% of respondents experienced IPV in the last 12 months where 10.1% suffered from physical, 4.8% suffered from sexual, and 7.8% suffered from emotional violence.

Table 1: Prevalence of different types of intimate partner violence (n=3,826)

Variables	Categories	Lifetime		Last 12 months	
		n	%	n	%
IPV	Yes	983	25.7	520	13.6
	No	2843	74.3	3306	86.4
Physical Violence	Yes	842	22.1	384	10.1
	No	2984	77.9	3442	89.9
Sexual Violence	Yes	297	7.8	183	4.8
	No	3529	92.2	3643	95.2
Emotional Violence	Yes	485	12.7	300	7.8
	No	3341	87.3	3526	92.2

Socio-demographic factors with lifetime intimate partner violence

Table 2 shows the relationship between socio-demographic variables and lifetime IPV against women. Age group,

ethnicity, religion, education, occupation, number of children, wealth quintile, ecological region, developmental region, cigarette smoking, respondents witnessing fathers beating their mother and husband's consumption of alcohol were associated with intimate partner violence.

Table 2: Lifetime intimate partner violence and its socio-demographic factors (n=3826)

Variables	Categories	Any type of violence		
variables		Yes (%)	No (%)	p value
	<25	180(21.1)	675(78.9)	
Aga grayn (in yaara)	25-34	394(25.6)	1144(74.4)	0.001
Age group (in years)	35-45	335(28.4)	844(71.6)	
	>45	74(29.1)	180(70.9)	
	Lower caste	193(34.2)	372(65.8)	
Ethnicity	Other caste	566(29.8)	1333(70.2)	<0.001
	Upper caste	224(16.4)	1138(83.6)	

Religion		Hindu	850(25.2)	2520(74.8)	
Control Cont	Religion				< 0.001
Primary 203(28.7) 504(71.3) 600(14	0				
Education Primary 203(28.7) 504(71.3) -0.001 Helgher 172(20.4) 670(79.6) -0.001 Higher 75(11.0) 605(89.0) -0.001 Higher 75(11.0) 605(89.0) -0.001 Cocupation Agriculture 256(26.4) 146(76.5) -0.001 Bob 123(23.1) 410(76.9) -0.001 Skilled/unskilled manual 894(2.0) 123(58.0) -0.001 Skilled/unskilled manual 894(2.0) 123(58.0) -0.001 Mumber of children 1-2 422(22.6) 1444(77.4) -0.001 5-5 436(30.7) 985(69.3) -0.001 5-5 436(30.7) 985(69.3) -0.001 Foorer 235(28.7) 583(71.3) -0.001 Kealth quintile Middle 235(28.7) 583(71.3) -0.001 Kicher 193(25.9) 551(74.1) -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.001 -0.0		No education			
Aducation Secondary 172(20.4) 670(79.6) 4.000 Higher 75(11.0) 605(89.0) 4.000 4.		Primary			
Description Higher (Did not work) (Pid n	Education	•			< 0.001
Occupation Agriculture 526(26.4) 1467(73.6) -0.001 Job 123(23.1) 410/76.9) -0.001 Killed/unskilled manual 89(42.0) 123(58.0) -0.001 Number of children 1-2 422(22.6) 1444(77.4) -0.001 5-5 71(33.5) 141(66.5) -0.001 Poorest 210(23.7) 676(76.3) -0.001 Middle 243(31.2) 535(68.8) <0.001		Higher	75(11.0)	605(89.0)	
Scilled Skilled Manual		Did not work	245(22.5)	843(77.5)	
Poblic 123 1		Agriculture	526(26.4)	1467(73.6)	0.001
Number of children	Occupation	Job	123(23.1)	410(76.9)	<0.001
Number of children 1-2 422(22.6) 1444(77.4) →0.001 3-5 436(30.7) 985(69.3) →0.001 Poorest 210(23.7) 676(76.3) →0.001 Wealth quintile Middle 243(31.2) 535(68.8) <0.001		Skilled/unskilled manual	89(42.0)	123(58.0)	
Number of children 3-5 436(30.7) 985(69.3) <0.001 Poorest 210(23.7) 676(76.3)		0	54(16.5)	273(83.5)	
S	NI 1 C 1-11	1-2	422(22.6)	1444(77.4)	-0.001
Poorest 210(23.7) 676(76.3) Poorest 235(28.7) 583(71.3) Poorest 235(28.7) 535(68.8) <0.001 Poorest Poo	Number of children	3-5	436(30.7)	985(69.3)	<0.001
Wealth quintile Poorer 235(28.7) 583(71.3) Annual control Wealth quintile Middle 243(31.2) 535(68.8) <0.001		>5	71(33.5)	141(66.5)	
Wealth quintile Middle 243(31.2) 535(68.8) <0.001 Richer 193(25.9) 551(74.1) ————————————————————————————————————		Poorest	210(23.7)	676(76.3)	
Richer 193(25.9) 551(74.1)		Poorer	235(28.7)	583(71.3)	
Richest 102(17.0) 498(83.0) Augustan Ecological zone Hill 368(20.5) 1431(79.5) <0.001	Wealth quintile	Middle	243(31.2)	535(68.8)	< 0.001
Ecological zone Mountain 58(19.7) 236(80.3) August 17(9.5) < 0.001 Ecological zone Hill 368(20.5) 1431(79.5) < 0.001		Richer	193(25.9)	551(74.1)	
Ecological zone Hill 368(20.5) 1431(79.5) <0.001 Terai 557(32.1) 1176(67.9) 1176(67.4) 1176(6		Richest	102(17.0)	498(83.0)	
Terai 557(32.1) 1176(67.9)		Mountain	58(19.7)	236(80.3)	
Development region Eastern 195(26.1) 551(73.9) Accepted (2013) 638(68.7) Accepted (2013)	Ecological zone	Hill	368(20.5)	1431(79.5)	< 0.001
Development region Central 291(31.3) 638(68.7) Account of the part of t		Terai	557(32.1)	1176(67.9)	
Development region Western 174(21.1) 649(78.9) <0.001 Mid-western 207(25.2) 614(74.8) -0.001 Far- western 116(22.9) 391(77.1) -0.619 Type of residence Urban 618(26.0) 1762(74.0) 0.619 Rural 365(25.2) 1081(74.8) 0.619 No 853(24.2) 2668(75.8) -0.001 Respondent's fathers beat her mother No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) -0.001 Respondent's fathers beat her mother Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001		Eastern	195(26.1)	551(73.9)	
Mid-western 207(25.2) 614(74.8) Far- western 116(22.9) 391(77.1) Type of residence Urban 618(26.0) 1762(74.0) 0.619 Rural 365(25.2) 1081(74.8) 0.619 Respondentis moking No 853(24.2) 2668(75.8) 0.001 Respondentis fathers beat her mother No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) 0.001 Respondentis fathers beat her mother Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001		Central	291(31.3)	638(68.7)	
Far- western 116(22.9) 391(77.1) 170 1	Development region	Western	174(21.1)	649(78.9)	< 0.001
Type of residence Urban Rural 618(26.0) 1762(74.0) 1081(74.8) 0.619 Cigarette smoking No 853(24.2) 2668(75.8) 2668(75.8) 748 0.001 Respondent's fathers beat her mother No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) 749 0.001 Respondent's fathers beat her mother Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) 749 0.001 Husband age (in years) 25 76(20.2) 301(79.8) 76(20.2) 301(79.8) 76(20.2) 301(79.8) 76(20.2) 301(79.8) 76(20.2) 301(79.8) 76(20.2) 76(Mid-western	207(25.2)	614(74.8)	
Rural 365(25.2) 1081(74.8) 0.619		Far- western	116(22.9)	391(77.1)	
Rural 365(25.2) 1081(74.8) Cigarette smoking No 853(24.2) 2668(75.8) Yes 130(42.6) 175(57.4) No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001	Type of residence	Urban	618(26.0)	1762(74.0)	0.610
Cigarette smoking Yes 130(42.6) 175(57.4) <0.001 Respondent's fathers beat her mother No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) <0.001	Type of residence	Rural	365(25.2)	1081(74.8)	0.019
Yes 130(42.6) 175(57.4) Respondent's fathers beat her mother No 725(22.6) 2490(77.4) Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001	Cigarette smoking	No	853(24.2)	2668(75.8)	<0.001
Respondent's fathers beat her mother Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001 Don't Know 25(39.1) 39(60.9) <25	Cigarette smoking	Yes	130(42.6)	175(57.4)	\0.001
Yes 233(42.6) 314(57.4) <0.001 Mon't Know 25(39.1) 39(60.9) 39(60.9) 25(5) 76(20.2) 301(79.8)	Despendent's fathers heat her	No	725(22.6)	2490(77.4)	
Husband educational level Don't Know 25(39.1) 39(60.9)	-	Yes	233(42.6)	314(57.4)	< 0.001
Husband age (in years) 25-34 335(23.7) 1078(76.3) 0.004 35-45 314(26.3) 880(73.7) >45 211(29.1) 513(70.9) No education 243(41.5) 342(58.5) Primary 272(31.5) 592(68.5) Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1)	mouner	Don't Know	25(39.1)	39(60.9)	
Husband age (in years) 35-45 314(26.3) 880(73.7) >45 211(29.1) 513(70.9) No education 243(41.5) 342(58.5) Primary 272(31.5) Secondary 293(79.1)		<25	76(20.2)	301(79.8)	
35-45 314(26.3) 880(73.7) >45 211(29.1) 513(70.9) No education 243(41.5) 342(58.5) Primary 272(31.5) 592(68.5) Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1) <0.001	Husband age (in years)	25-34	335(23.7)	1078(76.3)	0.004
No education 243(41.5) 342(58.5) Primary 272(31.5) 592(68.5) Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1) <0.001	Truspania age (ili years)	35-45	314(26.3)	880(73.7)	0.001
Husband educational level Primary 272(31.5) 592(68.5) <0.001 Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1) <0.001		>45	211(29.1)	513(70.9)	
Husband educational level Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1)		No education	243(41.5)	342(58.5)	
Secondary 341(20.9) 1293(79.1)	Husband educational level	•	272(31.5)	592(68.5)	<0.001
Higher 80(12.8) 545(87.2)	Trasbulla educational level	Secondary	341(20.9)	1293(79.1)	\U.UUI
		Higher	80(12.8)	545(87.2)	

	Did not work	31(24.8)	94(75.2)	
Husband occupation	Agriculture	211(25.8)	607(74.2)	< 0.001
Trusband occupation	Service	315(21.4)	1155(78.6)	<0.001
	Skilled/unskilled manual	375(29.5)	888(70.5)	
Husband's alcohol consumption	No	336(16.7)	1681(83.3)	< 0.001
Husband's alcohol consumption	Yes	647(35.8)	1162(64.2)	<0.001

Factors associated with intimate partner violence

All the variables that were significant in the chi-square test were selected for the regression analysis. In the adjusted analysis ethnicity, religion, education, occupation, number of children, ecological zone, developmental region, cigarette smoking, husband education, respondents witnessing fathers beating their mothers and husband's drinking alcohol were statistically significant with lifetime IPV.

Women belonging to the lower caste (AOR: 1.41, 95%CI=1.07-1.85) and other caste (AOR: 1.26, 95% CI=1.01-1.58) were more likely to report IPV as compared to the women of upper caste. Women with no education were 1.95 times; primary level education were 1.9 times and with secondary level education were 1.6 times more likely to report IPV as compared to the women of higher

education. Women of middle class were at more risk of IPV compared to women of richest family (Table 3).

Women whose husband had no education and primary education were more likely to report IPV as compared to the women whose husband had higher education. Similarly, respondents witnessing fathers beating their mother was significantly associated with IPV. Woman's whose husband consumes alcohol had higher odds of reporting IPV compared to non-alcohol users (AOR: 2.5, 95% CI= 2.14-3.02) (Table 3).

The Hosmer and Lemeshow test was done to check the model fitness (p>0.05). The Nagelkerke R square was 0.206 in the study. It means 20.3% variation in the IPV is explained by factors included in the model.

Table 3: Logistic regression analysis with factors association with lifetime intimate partner violence

Variables	Categories	Crude OR(95%CI)	AOR(95%CI)	p value
Age group (in years)	<25	Ref		Ref
	25-34	1.29(1.06-1.58)	1.09(0.82-1.44)	0.569
	35-45	1.49(1.21-1.83)	1.13(0.78-1.65)	0.518
	>45	1.54(1.12-2.11)	1.05(0.62-1.77)	0.866
	Upper caste	Ref		Ref
Ethnicity	Other caste	2.16(1.81-2.57)	1.26(1.01-1.58)	0.042
	Lower caste	2.64(2.10-3.30)	1.41(1.07-1.85)	0.014
Religion	Hindu	Ref		Ref
	Buddha	0.66(0.45-0.99)	0.55(0.35-0.85)	0.007
	Others	1.64(1.27-2.11)	1.35(1.01-1.82)	0.046
Education	No education	4.04(3.11-5.24)	1.95(1.36-2.79)	< 0.001
	Primary	3.25(2.43-4.34)	1.91(1.34-2.71)	< 0.001
	Secondary	2.07(1.55-2.78)	1.62(1.16-2.25)	0.005
	Higher	Ref		Ref
Occupation	Did not work	Ref		Ref
	Agriculture	1.23(1.04-1.47)	1.25(1.01-1.54)	0.037
	Service	1.03(0.81-1.32)	1.42(1.06-1.90)	0.018
	Skilled/unskilled manual	2.49(1.83-3.39)	1.90(1.33-2.70)	< 0.001

	0	Ref		Ref
Number of children	1-2	1.48(1.08-2.02)	1.44(1.00-2.09)	0.050
	3-5	2.24(1.64-3.06)	1.57(1.04-2.35)	0.031
	>5	2.55(1.69-3.83)	1.57(0.93-2.65)	0.090
	Poorest	1.52(1.17-1.97)	1.04(0.71-1.52)	0.850
	Poorer	1.97(1.52-2.56)	1.30(0.92-1.84)	1.131
Wealth quintile	Middle	2.22(1.71-2.88)	1.36(0.99-1.89)	0.061
	Richer	1.71(1.31-2.24)	1.25(0.91-1.71)	0.162
	Richest	Ref		Ref
	Mountain	Ref		Ref
Ecological zone	Hill	1.05(0.77-1.43)	1.02(0.71-1.46)	0.933
	Terai	1.93(1.42-2.61)	1.83(1.25-2.68)	0.002
	Eastern	1.19(0.92-1.55)	1.26(0.92-1.72)	1.153
	Central	1.54(1.19-1.97)	1.74(1.29-2.35)	< 0.001
Development region	Western	0.90(0.69-1.18)	1.16(0.84-1.59)	0.374
	Mid-western	1.14(0.87-1.47)	1.41(1.04-1.91)	0.027
	Far- western	Ref		Ref
Ciganatta ana alzina	No	Ref		Ref
Cigarette smoking	Yes	2.32(1.83-2.95)	2.05(1.54-2.74)	< 0.001
	<25	Ref		Ref
Husband (:)	25-34	1.23(0.93-1.63)	0.89(0.62-1.27)	0.521
Husband age (in years)	35-45	1.41(1.07-1.88)	0.78(0.51-1.19)	0.245
	>45	1.63(1.21-2.19)	0.81(0.50-1.32)	0.392
	No education	4.84(3.63-6.45)	1.84(1.27-2.66)	0.001
Husband educational level	Primary	3.13(2.38-4.12)	1.44(1.02-2.03)	0.036
Trusbaria educational lever	Secondary	1.80(1.38-2.34)	1.13(0.84-1.53)	0.419
	Higher	Ref		Ref
	Did not work	Ref		Ref
Husband occupation	Agriculture	1.05(0.69-1.63)	0.78(0.48-1.26)	0.304
	Service	0.83(0.54-1.26)	0.85(0.53-1.35)	0.488
	Skilled/unskilled manual	1.27(0.83-1.94)	0.80(0.50-1.27)	0.336
n 1 . C.1 1	No	Ref		Ref
Respondents fathers beat her mother	Yes	2.55(2.11-3.08)	2.25(1.81-2.78)	< 0.001
momer	Don't Know	2.20(1.32-3.66)	1.81(1.02-3.22)	0.044
Husband's alcohol consumption	No	Ref		Ref
	Yes	2.79(2.39-3.24)	2.54(2.14-3.02)	<0.001

DISCUSSION

The study revealed the prevalence of lifetime IPV which was 25.7% whereas prevalence of IPV in the last 12 months was 13.6%. According to a study conducted in Nepal in 2011, showed that about 15% of young and middle-aged married women reported some form of violence in the last

12 months.¹⁹ Similarly, another study conducted in 2011 in Nepal found that 28.31% of women had been exposed to IPV in the last 12 months.¹⁰ According to the other study conducted in rural Nepal in 2011 showed that 51.9% of women have reported having experienced some form of

violence in their lifetime.⁶ The prevalence of life time IPV from the referenced study conducted in 2011 in Nepal showed almost double than the prevalence reported in this study. Because of the wide variance in prevalence across different studies, it is important to do further research on related topics.³ The difference might be due to time gap in between the studies. The interventions in Nepal in recent time focuses on women's health, education and empowerment, which may have impacted in lowering the prevalence of IPV.

In this study, 22.1% of women have experienced physical, 7.8% have experienced sexual, and 12.7% have experienced emotional violence during their lifetime whereas 10.1% have experienced physical, 4.8% have experienced sexual and 7.8% have experienced emotional violence in the last 12 months. In this study, physical violence was reported higher than emotional violence. It might be due to lack of perceiving emotional violence compare to physical violence and it might be due to the social acceptance of emotional violence in Nepal. The study done in eastern India showed that overall prevalence of physical, psychological, sexual and any other form of violence were 16%, 52%, 25% and 56% respectively.20 WHO multi-country study done in 2005 in 10 countries regarding women's health and domestic violence during their life time by their intimate partner showed the varying of prevalence from 13% in Japan to 48.7% in Ethiopia. Similarly, sexual violence was found varying from 6.2% in Japan to 58.6% in Ethiopia whereas for emotional violence it was observed 4.5% in Japan to 15.7% in Peru.²¹

In comparison to the women with higher education, women with no education were more likely to be the victims of IPV. Women whose husband had primary, secondary and higher education were less likely to report IPV, compared to the women whose husband had no education. This study revealed that education of both partners was one of the most important correlates of IPV in Nepal; which was also evident in previous other studies.^{2,10} In this study, women who had engaged themselves in service, agriculture, or other works were more likely to experience IPV than women who are at home without any formal job or labor work. The study done in rural Nepal showed that risk of violence was more than two times higher among women who were in agriculture or daily wages occupation as compared to the women who were in service or small businesses.⁶ Women's engagement in economic activities empowers them, gives them decision-making authority, and have reporting tendency against any form of violence compare to women who do not have any service or job.

In this study, there was association between husband's alcohol consumption and IPV. The study carried out by WHO in multi-countries also showed the similar result in terms of alcohol consumption by male partner and IPV.² Study done in rural Uganda also showed that women whose husband frequently consumed alcohol were 4.6 times more prone to suffer from IPV than whose husband never drink alcohol. Similarly, women whose husband drink alcohol occasionally were 1.6 times higher at risk of IPV compared to women whose husband never consume alcohol.²²

Number of children was also found to be significantly associated with IPV in this study. Similarly, another study done in Nepal showed that there is an association between higher number of children and IPV.10 In contrast to this, the study done in Uganda reported that women with many children had significantly lower risks of violence than the reference group that is 0 to 1 number of children.²² In this study, women witnessing father beating their mother were more likely to report IPV. The similar result was shown by the study carried out in multi-country by WHO which showed that women reported higher IPV when their mother was abused by their partner.² Similarly, the Serbian report showed the mother who was beaten by her partner was also substantially correlated with IPV (OR 2.75).²³ Women who have experienced and witnessed violence against their mother by their father may perceive violence against them by their partner is acceptable.

CONCLUSION

The lifetime prevalence of IPV was 22.1% for physical, 7.8% for sexual and 12.7% for emotional whereas it was 10.1%, 4.8%, and 7.8%, respectively for physical, sexual and emotional violence in the last 12 months. The factors associated with IPV were respondent's education, respondents' husband education, cigarette smoking, husband's alcohol consumption, respondents witnessing fathers beating their mother, ethnicity, religion, occupation and number of children. Intervention programs to address IPV should target on the afore mentioned factors. Formal education of both male and female and prevention of substance abuse might be the important strategies to reduce the IPV in Nepal. Further research should be done to understand men's use of alcohol/smoking and violence to tailor the prevention and management programs that address both alcohol/smoking and violence issues.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Authors' contribution: SW contributed to the study design, data analysis and draft manuscript preparation. GP and BS involved in the study design and critically revised the manuscript. All authors read and approved the manuscript.

Funding: No fund was received for the study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors acknowledge Measures DHS for the access of 2016 NDHS dataset.

REFERENCES

- 1. WHO. Violence against Women. Fact sheet. Nov, 2017. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women
- 2. Abramsky T, Watts CH, Garcia-Moreno C, Devries K, Kiss L, Ellsberg M, Heise L. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. BMC public health, 2011, 11(1), 109.
- 3. Sapkota D, Bhattarai S, Baral D, Pokharel PK. Domestic violence and its associated factors among married women of a village development committee of rural Nepal. BMC research notes, 2016, 9(1), 178.
- 4. Campbell J, Jones AS, Dienemann J, et al. Intimate partner violence and physical health consequences. Arch Intern Med 2002;162:1157e63.
- 5. Coker AL, Smith PH, Bethea L, et al. Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. Arch Fam Med 2000;9:451e7
- 6. Lamichhane P, Puri M, Tamang J, Dulal B. Women's status and violence against young married women in rural Nepal. BMC women's health, 2011, 11(1), 19.
- 7. Budhathoki N, Bhusal S, Ojha H, Basnet S. Violence against women by their husband and postpartum depression. Journal of Nepal Health Research Council, 2013.
- 8. Puri M, Frost M, Tamang J, Lamichhane P, Shah I. The prevalence and determinants of sexual violence against young married women by husbands in rural Nepal. BMC research notes, 2012,5(1), 291.
- 9. World Health Organization. Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. World Health Organization, 2013.
- 10. Atteraya MS, Gnawali S, Song IH. Factors associated with intimate partner violence against married women in Nepal. Journal of interpersonal violence. 2015 Apr;30(7):1226-46.
- 11. Semahegn A, Mengistie B. Domestic violence against

- women and associated factors in Ethiopia; systematic review. Reproductive health. 2015 Dec;12(1):78.
- 12. Dhakal S. Nepalese women under the shadow of domestic violence. The Lancet, 2008, 371(9612), 547-548
- 13. Puri M, Tamang J, Shah I. Suffering in silence: consequences of sexual violence within marriage among young women in Nepal. BMC public health, 2011, 11(1), 29.
- 14. Nepal Demographic and Health Survey2016; Ministry of Health and Population (MoHP): Kathmandu, Nepal; New ERA and ICF International: Calverton, MD, USA, 2012. Available online: http://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf (Accessed on 7 October 2017).
- 15. Measure DHS: Demographic and Health Surveys. Available online: http://www.dhsprogram.com (accessed on 21 January 2019).
- 16. García-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts C. WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2005;204:1-8.
- 17. Karkee R, Lee AH, Khanal V. Need factors for utilization of institutional delivery services in Nepal: An analysis from Nepal Demographic and Health Survey, 2011. BMJ Open 2014, 4, e004372.
- 18. Sharma B, Nam EW. Condom Use at Last Sexual Intercourse and Its Correlates among Males and Females Aged 15–49 Years in Nepal. International journal of environmental research and public health, 2018, 15(3), 535.
- 19. Dhakal L, Berg-Beckhoff G, Aro AR. Intimate partner violence (physical and sexual) and sexually transmitted infection: results from Nepal Demographic Health Survey 2011. International journal of women's health. 2014;6:75.
- 20. Babu BV, Kar SK. Domestic violence against women in eastern India: a population-based study on prevalence and related issues. BMC public health, 2009, 9(1), 129.
- 21. World Health Organization. (2005). WHO multicountry study on women's health and domestic violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses.
- 22. Koenig MA, Lutalo T, Zhao F, Nalugoda F, Wabwire-Mangen F, Kiwanuka N, Gray R. Domestic violence in rural Uganda: evidence from a community-based study. Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 2003, 81, 53-60.
- 23. Djikanovic B, Jansen HA, Otasevic S. Factors associated with intimate partner violence against women in Serbia: a cross-sectional study. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 2010 Aug 1;64(8):728-35.