

# Intimate partner violence (IPV) types are common among Turkish women from high socioeconomic status and have differing effects on child abuse and contentment with life

 Hesna Gul,<sup>1</sup>  Ahmet Gul,<sup>2</sup>  Koray Kara<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Gulhane Training and Research Hospital, Ankara, Turkey

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Ufuk University Faculty of Medicine, Ankara, Turkey

## ABSTRACT

**OBJECTIVE:** Intimate partner violence (IPV) against women is an important public health problem. We aimed to investigate exposure of IPV types, child abuse and decrease in life contentment of married women from high socioeconomic status in Turkey.

**METHODS:** Data were collected by an online/written questionnaire and Contentment with Life Scale. The questionnaire includes definitions of physical, emotional, economic and sexual IPV and asks how many times they experienced these types of abuse.

**RESULTS:** We found that physical, emotional, economic and sexual IPV exposure were 19%, 45.2%, 12.5%, and 6%, respectively. It means that IPV types are common in this group too. Physical child abuse was higher among physical and emotional IPV victims ( $p=0.004$ ,  $p=0.02$ , respectively), while emotional child abuse was higher only among physical IPV victims ( $p=0.01$ ). On the other hand, exposure to economic and sexual IPV was not related to any type of child abuse in this sample ( $p>0.05$ ). Physical and economic IPV victims were statistically older ( $p=0.004$ ,  $p<0.001$ , respectively), married for longer time ( $p<0.001$  for both) and had relatively lower education level ( $p<0.001$  for both), while sexual IPV victims had lower education level than non-victims ( $p=0.03$ ). We demonstrated that physical-emotional and sexual intramarital IPV significantly reduce the women's contentment with life scores when compared with non-victims ( $p=0.02$ ,  $p<0.001$  and  $p=0.03$ , respectively).

**CONCLUSION:** IPV exposure is also severe among married women with high socioeconomic levels and is associated with child abuse in family and a decrease in life contentment. Lengthened education period among women with similar socioeconomic levels may be an additional protective factor for IPV by delaying the age of marriage and increasing the individual income.

*Keywords: Child abuse; contentment with life; economic abuse; emotional abuse; intimate partner violence; physical abuse; sexual abuse.*

**Cite this article as:** Gul H, Gul A, Kara K. Intimate partner violence (IPV) types are common among Turkish women from high socioeconomic status and have differing effects on child abuse and contentment with life. *North Clin Istanbul*

Violence against women is an important public health problem in all societies. It is an important risk factor for women's both physical and mental health. One of the violence type, and perhaps the most traumatic is intimate partner violence (IPV) where women are exposed to violence by their romantic partners. This type of vio-

lence includes mainly physical and sexual violence along with emotional and economic behaviors [1]. Studies demonstrated that women are exposed to more physical (24.3%) and sexual (9.4%) violence compared to men in their romantic relationships [2]. However, the number of studies related to the rate and severity of emotional and

Received: May 26, 2019 Accepted: January 21, 2020 Online: February 13, 2020



Correspondence: Dr. Hesna GUL. Gulhane Egitim ve Arastirma Hastanesi, Cocuk ve Ergen Ruh Sagligi ve Hastaliklari Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, Turkey.  
Tel: +90 507 152 39 52 e-mail: drhesnagul@gmail.com

© Copyright 2020 by Istanbul Provincial Directorate of Health - Available online at [www.northclinist.com](http://www.northclinist.com)

economic violence are scarce. Exposure to IPV causes many negative results. Among these results the most important ones are: psychiatric problems like depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, eating disorders, substance abuse, and reductions in quality of life [2–7] social problems like being left homeless-penniless [8], and violence towards accompanying children [9] low academic success [5] and sexually-transmitted diseases [2].

Studies in different cultures and geographies revealed that there are some common risk factors for IPV. Especially sociocultural norms which accept domestic violence towards women as 'normal', low socioeconomic and educational level of women, being exposed to abuse and neglect in childhood, poverty, heavy alcohol-drug use and psychiatric problems of the partner [10–14] are the most important ones in these risk factors. Studies from Turkey also demonstrated similar risk factors. In a recent review, authors addressed the risk factors of IPV in three headings; socio-demographic characteristics, personal problems of victim and problems related to marriage. Among sociodemographic risk factors, living in rural areas, low income and low educational level, unemployment, lack of health insurance and young age are determined. Risks related to personal characteristics include general health, gynecological, psychiatric problems, and exposure to violence in childhood and/or afterwards. Risks related to marriage include being in the first years of marriage, unwanted/forced marriage, large family, living with many people in the same house, early marriage age, multiple marriages, having many children and violence against their children [1]. To date IPV studies are mainly completed on women with high risk such as from low socioeconomic and sociocultural level and from the samples who applied to hospitals due to legal processes or medical problems. Though studies offer important information and results about rates and risk factors, we can not generalize the findings to all women in Turkey. In our country, as in many countries where violence against women is an acceptable norm, risk factors and rates may not be limited to those determined and even at high socioeconomic level, IPV exposure may affect women's violence toward their children and contentment with life.

In this study we aimed to identify the different types of marriage-related IPV in a group that has not been previously studied in Turkey (with no known psychiatric and medical disease, high socioeconomic level, with no relative risk factors) and to identify the effect of violence types on life satisfaction and the correlation with physical/emotional violence against children in family.

Our hypotheses are as follows

- H1. The IPV risk in Turkey is even high for women with high socioeconomic level.
- H2. Women exposed to types of violence have lower contentment with life.
- H3. Women exposed to types of violence have higher rates of physical and emotional violence towards their children.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study Design

This cross sectional study was conducted in the Psychiatry Department of Ufuk University Hospital, Ankara, Turkey. The Clinical Research Ethics Committee of our hospital approved the study procedures (IRB Number: 20180215/3). We prepared and applied the questionnaire (written or online) which includes sociodemographic data form, violence exposure questionnaire and Contentment with Life Scale.

### Participants

Participants were recruited from the health workers and/or the mothers of children who were referred to the outpatient services of pediatric health units in Ufuk University. Inclusion criteria were: being at least high school graduate, being still married, having at least one child and accept to participate to the study. Exclusion criteria were: do not want to participate the study and having a known psychiatric disease and/or symptom which require psychiatric treatment. Three hundred and thirty-six women accepted to participate in the study. The mean age of these women was  $36.14 \pm 8.23$  years, with mean monthly income level  $5235 \pm 3852$  Turkish Lira, mean educational duration of  $16.0 \pm 2.2$  years and mean marriage duration of  $10.36 \pm 8.8$  years (Table 1).

**TABLE 1.** Socio demographical features (n=336)

Variables	Mean±SD	Min.–Max.
Age (year)	36.14±8.23	25–63
Socioeconomical parameters		
Monthly income (Turkish Lira)	5235±3852	0–20.000
Total education time (year)	16.0±2.2	11–19
Total marriage time (year)	10.36±8.8	1–36

SD: Standard deviation

### Sociodemographic Data Form

This information form was about demographic characteristics (age, education, personal monthly income, time of marriage etc.) of the participants.

### Violence Exposure Questionnaire

This questionnaire asked whether participants had experienced physical violence, emotional violence, economic violence and sexual violence by their husbands. Firstly, intimate partner violence types were defined with the encompassed behavior and attitudes in detail, then asked how many times they had experienced these types of violence during the length of their marriage as best they can remember. The questions were as follows:

**For physical IPV:** Has your husband ever applied physical violence to you until you married? If so, how many times? If you have not, please answer '0' to this question. ("Physical violence" includes all hurtful physical behaviors such as slapping, throwing something, hitting, dragging, tattooing, squeezing your throat etc.)

**For emotional IPV:** Has your husband ever applied emotional violence to you until you married? If so, how many times? If you have not, please answer '0' to this question. (Emotional violence includes insulting, swearing, humiliation, threaten with harm etc.)

**For economic IPV:** Has your husband ever applied economic violence to you until you married? If so, how many times? If you have not, please answer '0' to this question. (Economic violence includes the behaviors such as preventing or forcing you to leave work, not giving enough money for your, home's and children's needs, and getting your own money by force, if any etc.)

**For sexual IPV:** Has your husband ever applied sexual violence to you until you married? If so, how many times? If you have not, please answer '0' to this question. (Sexual violence includes the behaviors of enforcement the sexual intercourse, hurtful sexual behaviors, do not find attractive and humiliation etc.)

**For physical abuse to their child:** Do you apply physical violence (beating or hurting) to

**TABLE 2.** Differences of socio-demographic variables between IPV victims and non-victims

	Physical IPV		Emotional IPV		Economic IPV		Sexual IPV	
	Victims (n=64)	Non-victims (n=272)	Victims (n=152)	Non-victims (n=184)	Victims (n=42)	Non-victims (n=294)	Victims (n=20)	Non-victims (n=316)
Age (year)	38.7±9.0	35.5±7.9	35.3±7.9	36.7±8.4	42.5±9.7	35.2±7.5	37.0±9.55	36.08±8.15
		t=-2.88, p=0.004 Cohen's d=0.37		t=1.57, p=0.117		t=5.61, p<0.001, Cohen's d=0.84		t=-0.47, p=0.632
Education time (year)	15.06±2.2	16.26±2.2	15.83±2.3	16.20±2.2	13.95±2.1	16.33±2.1	15.00±2.3	16.10±2.2
		t=-3.90, p<0.001 Cohen's d=-0.54		t=1.49, p=0.136		t=6.78, p<0.001, Cohen's d=-1.13		t=2.12, p=0.03, Cohen's d=-0.48
Marriage time (year)	14.18±9.6	9.45±8.46	10.07±8.9	10.59±8.8	17.19±10.1	9.38±8.27	10.75±9.5	10.33±8.8
		t=-3.90, p<0.001, Cohen's d=0.52		t=0.59, p=0.590		t=-5.50, p<0.001, Cohen's d=0.84		t=-0.20, p=0.840
Personal monthly income	3903±4278	5549±3684	5107±4164	5341±3582	3252±2901	5519±3891	3550±1944	5342±3919
		t=3.11, p=0.002, Cohen's d=-0.41		t=0.55, p=0.581		t=3.61, p<0.001, Cohen's d=-0.66		t=2.02, p=0.04, Cohen's d=-0.57
		r=-0.20				r=0.38		r=-0.27

IPV: Intimate partner violence; all analysis were one-tailed, Cohen's d values were added to the statistically significant results.

your child when you are angry to your husband due to his behaviors?

**For emotional abuse to their child:** Do you apply emotional violence (shouting, humiliating etc.) to your child when you are angry to your husband due to his behaviors?

### Contentment with Life Scale

The scale was developed by Lavallee et al. (2007) and includes 5 items [15]. It is a 7-point Likert scale ("1" Definitely disagree to "7" Definitely agree). The internal consistency of the scale was 0.87. Items 3 and 4 are coded inversely. The scale was adapted to Turkish by Akin and Yalniz and validity and reliability studies performed by them [16]. High points show a high level of life satisfaction.

### Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) software (version 22.0; SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Demographic information was analyzed through descriptive statistics. Chi-square test was used for categorical variables.

Kolmogorov- Smirnov test was used to test for normality. The scale scores, education time, marriage time, monthly incomes were compared with Student's T-test or Mann-Whitney U test. Correlation analysis was performed by Pearson or Spearman correlation tests. A p value <0.05 was accepted as statistically significant.

## RESULTS

**The Results Of Physical IPV:** We found that 19% of the sample reported physical IPV exposure at least once by their husbands. When we divided the sample in two subgroups as physical IPV victims and Non-victims, we found that victims were older, and had longer marriage times ( $p < 0.001$ ) while had lower education level, monthly income and life satisfaction scores ( $p < 0.001$ ,  $p = 0.002$  and  $p = 0.02$ , respectively). Among physical IPV victims, the rate of physical child abuse was 53.1% and the rate of emotional child abuse was 96.9%. The rate of physical and emotional violence against children were significantly higher among the physical IPV victims (Table 2, 3).

**The Results of Emotional IPV:** We found that 45.2 % of the sample reported emotional IPV expo-

**TABLE 3.** Comparison of child maltreatment and contentment with life between IPV victims and non-victims

	Physical IPV		Emotional IPV		Economic IPV		Sexual IPV	
	Victims (n=64)	Non-victims (n=272)	Victims (n=152)	Non-victims (n=184)	Victims (n=42)	Non-victims (n=294)	Victims (n=20)	Non-victims (n=316)
Physical child abuse	34 (53.1%)	92 (33.8%)	66 (43.4%)	60 (32.6%)	20 (47.6%)	106 (36.1%)	10 (50%)	116 (92.1%)
	$\chi^2 = 8.23$ $p = 0.004$ , Cramer's $V = 0.15$						$\chi^2 = 2.09$ $p = 0.102$	$\chi^2 = 1.41$ , $p = 0.170$
Emotional child abuse	62 (96.9%)	238 (87.5%)	136 (89.59)	164 (89.1%)	40 (95.2%)	260 (88.4%)	18 (90%)	282 (89.2%)
	$\chi^2 = 8.23$ $p = 0.004$ , Cramer's $V = 0.11$						$\chi^2 = 1.77$ , $p = 0.140$	$\chi^2 = 0.01$ , $p = 0.636$
Contentment with life scale	21.87±5.1	23.68±6.1	21.57±5.7	24.79±5.8	21.66±4.7	23.57±6.1	20.60±7.3	23.51±5.8
	$\chi^2 = 4.76$ , $p = 0.017$ , Cohen's $d = -0.32$ $r = -0.15$						$t = 1.94$ , $p = 0.053$	$t = 2.12$ , $p = 0.03$ , Cohen's $d = -0.44$ $r = -0.21$

IPV: Intimate partner violence; all analysis were one-tailed, Cohen's d and Cramer's V values were added to the statistically significant results.

sure at least once by their husbands. When we divided the sample in two subgroups as emotional IPV victims and Non-victims, we found that victims had significantly lower contentment with life scores ( $p < 0.001$ ). Among emotional IPV victims, physical and emotional child abuse were 43.4% and 89.5%, respectively. Physical child abuse was significantly higher in victim group than others ( $p = 0.02$ ) (Table 2, 3).

**The Results of Economic IPV:** We found that 12.5% of the sample reported economic IPV exposure at least once by their husbands. When we divided the sample in two subgroups as economic IPV victims and Non-victims, we found that victims were older, and had longer married times ( $p < 0.001$ ) while had lower education level and monthly income ( $p < 0.001$ ). Different to the other types of IPV there was no significant difference in contentment with life scores, physical-emotional child abuse between subgroups (Table 2, 3).

**The Results of Sexual IPV:** Finally, 6% of the women reported sexual IPV exposure at least once by their husbands. When we divided the sample in two subgroups as sexual IPV victims and Non-victims, the educational levels, monthly income and life satisfaction scores were significantly lower among victims than others. However, there was no difference between subgroups in terms of child abuse types (Table 2, 3).

## DISCUSSION

We demonstrated that IPV types were common among married women with high socioeconomic level, in Turkey. Additionally, our results demonstrated that physical and emotional IPV could be a risk factor for violence against child by mother in families (physical IPV is related with physical and emotional child abuse and emotional IPV is related with physical child abuse) but contrary to this, exposure to economic and sexual IPV was not related with any types of child abuse among this group. Additionally, physical, economic and sexual IPV victims were older, had longer marriage time and had relatively lower educational levels, while emotional IPV victims were younger but had slightly lower educational levels. It was shown that, physical-emotional and sexual IPV significantly reduce the women's contentment with life in this low risky group, too.

According to the results of a large-sample study in Turkey (2015), generally the rates of domestic violence against women were 35.5% for physical violence, 43.9%

for emotional violence, 30% for economic violence and 12% for sexual violence [17]. Though the rates in our study appear low compared to this one, when we address our sample's sociodemographical features (the violence in our study was related with husband, the group had no known medical-psychiatric problem, had high educational and economic level) we demonstrated that women in this low risk group had also experienced high rates of husband IPV; and once again our results attracted attention to the importance of this topic. Studies about violence towards women have revealed that low educational level of women [18–21], low economic level [20, 22–25] and marrying at a young age increased the IPV. Our results showed that for husband IPV, even with high socioeconomic level, lengthened education period reduced physical, economic and sexual violence. On the other hand, being older and married for longer time could increase the risk of physical and economic violence in spite of all protective factors. These results are important and indicate some areas that were not previously studied. The first is that lengthened education period among women with similar socioeconomic level may be an additional protective factor. Probably, it delays the age of marriage, increases individual income and is indirectly effective in reducing IPV. The second possibility is that as awareness of the topic increases in developing countries like in ours, IPV reduces. This situation may mean that views on husband IPV accepted as a cultural norm are changing over time. These hypotheses should be addressed with longitudinal studies in larger samples.

Another important result of our study is the contentment with life-IPV relationship. In this low-risk group with no known psychiatric symptoms, we showed that exposure to physical, emotional and sexual IPV reduced contentment with life. Life satisfaction is defined as "results obtained when people compare their expectations with what they have" [16, 26]. This result in a group with capacity for satisfaction in many areas of life, like women with high socioeconomic level, once more displays the effect of marriage-related IPV on the mental health of women.

In our study, the rates of physical and emotional child abuse of IPV victims were investigated. We found that physical child abuse was higher among physical and emotional IPV victims, while emotional child abuse was higher only among physical IPV victims. Interestingly, there was not any difference between subgroups of other IPV types in terms of child abuse. Studies investigating the effect of witnessing parent's IPV demonstrated that this problem has affects in the short and long term

process. Among short-term results post traumatic stress disorder, cognitive delays and physical growth retardation while in the long term results increased risk-taking behavior, antisocial personality trait, depression, alcohol-substance abuse and negatives related to physical health may be listed [27–35]. Recently, a study which address the relationship between personality traits in adulthood and witnessing IPV in childhood found that individuals who witnessed IPV described more problematic parent-child relationships.

These individuals also had high rates of psychopathologies and lower life satisfaction in adulthood [36]. Another study stated that IPV witnessed children are also exposed the child abuse and neglect [37]. Although it is not possible to evaluate causality in a cross-sectional study like the present one, it can be speculated that witnessing to IPV could be a risk factor for mother-related child abuse in family. Thus according to our results, when children witness physical and emotional IPV of the father, there was an increase in violence against child by the mother, while the same relationship was not observed with economic and sexual IPV which have less chance of being witnessed in family. Studies demonstrated that physical and emotional IPV, woman's economic dependence on her partner, refusing to give her money or property to him if she has own, alcohol-substance abuse or extramarital relationships of the partner are important risk factors for economic IPV [37–39]. We could not find an evidence about the relationship between economic IPV exposure of mother and mother related child abuse. Due to our observations we can suggest that the risk factors defined for economic IPV are also valid for our country. However, with the effect of culture and religion, the belief "Husband should meet all the needs of his wife in marriage" is quite frequent in our country. This situation brings to mind that in our sample some types of economic violence could be interpreted and accepted by the wife more easily than the other types of IPV. For example, woman who had been left without money could interpret it as economize or, while the husband took her income, she could accept it with the thought that husband is the manager of household. These beliefs and coping methods could be effective in the reduction of anger directed towards child. Similar to the economic IPV, we could not find an evidence about the increase of child abuse among sexual IPV victims. When dealing with this type of violence, intramarital and extramarital sexual IPV should be investigated as different situations. There are many studies and evidences about

negative outcomes of witnessing mothers' sexual IPV in extramarital relationships, but on the other hand "how children be affected when they witness the intramarital sexual IPV?" is still a mystery [40]. Marriage seems to be a protective factor for child to witnessing sexual IPV and it's consequences. Presumably married women exposed to lower degrees of sexual violence and their children do not witness this type of IPV so this may reduce anger towards children.

Our study has some limitations. The relatively small sample size, the use of self-reported questionnaire and scale for data collection, cross-sectional study design and could not determinate the effects of process (e.g. processes related to early years of marriage or later years) are the important limitations of the study. On the other hand, we demonstrated that IPV exposure is also frequent among women from high socioeconomic level and is associated with the increase of mother related child abuse in family and decrease in life contentment.

We hope that increased awareness in this field make victim women express themselves more easily and be able to discover protection methods.

**Acknowledgements:** We have no conflict of interest to declare. We thank to Dr. Hayriye Mihrimah Ozturk for her help to collect data.

**Ethics Committee Approval:** Ufuk University, Non-interventional Clinical Research Evaluation Commission granted approval for this study (date: 15.02.2018, IRB Number: 20180215/3).

**Conflict of Interest:** No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

**Financial Disclosure:** The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

**Authorship Contributions:** Concept – HG, AG, KK; Design – HG, AG, KK; Supervision – HG, AG, KK; Fundings – HG, AG, KK; Materials – HG, AG, KK; Data collection and/or processing – HG, AG, KK; Analysis and/or interpretation – HG, AG, KK; Literature review – HG, AG, KK; Writing – HG, AG, KK; Critical review – HG, AG, KK.

## REFERENCES

1. Özcan NK, Günaydın S, Çitil ET. Domestic violence against women in Turkey: a systematic review and meta analysis. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs*. 2016;30(5):620-629.
2. Breiding MJ, Chen J, Black MC. Intimate partner violence in the United States--2010. 2014.
3. Achchappa B, Bhandary M, Unnikrishnan B, et al. Intimate partner violence, depression, and quality of life among women living with HIV/AIDS in a coastal city of south India. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care*. 2017;2325957417691137.
4. Danielson KK, Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Silva PA. Comorbidity between abuse of an adult and DSM-III-R mental disorders: evidence from an epidemiological study. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1998;155(1):131-133.

5. Golding JM. Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. *J Fam Violence*. 1999;14(2):99-132.
6. Hassija CM, Robinson D, Silva Y, Lewin MR. Dysfunctional Parenting and Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration and Victimization among College Women: the Mediating Role of Schemas. *J Fam Violence*. 2017;1-9.
7. Okuda M, Olfson M, Hasin D, Grant BF, Lin K-H, Blanco C. Mental health of victims of intimate partner violence: Results from a national epidemiologic survey. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2011;62(8):959-962.
8. Mitchell C, Anglin D. Intimate partner violence: A health-based perspective: OUP USA; 2009.
9. Guedes A, Bott S, Garcia-Moreno C, Colombini M. Bridging the gaps: a global review of intersections of violence against women and violence against children. *Glob Health Act*. 2016;9(1):31516.
10. Fulu E, Jewkes R, Roselli T, Garcia-Moreno C. Prevalence of and factors associated with male perpetration of intimate partner violence: findings from the UN Multi-country Cross-sectional Study on Men and Violence in Asia and the Pacific. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2013;1(4):e187-e207.
11. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet*. 2002;359(9315):1423-1429.
12. Kouyoumdjian FG, Calzavara LM, Bondy SJ, et al. Risk factors for intimate partner violence in women in the Rakai Community Cohort Study, Uganda, from 2000 to 2009. *BMC Public Health*. 2013;13(1):566.
13. Widom CS, Czaja S, Dutton MA. Child abuse and neglect and intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration: A prospective investigation. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2014;38(4):650-663.
14. Wong J, Mellor D. Intimate partner violence and women's health and wellbeing: Impacts, risk factors and responses. *Contemp Nurse*. 2014;46(2):170-179.
15. Lavallee LF, Hatch PM, Michalos AC, McKinley T. Development of the contentment with life assessment scale (CLAS): Using daily life experiences to verify levels of self-reported life satisfaction. *Soc Indic Res*. 2007;83(2):201-244.
16. Ahmet A, Ahmet Y. Yaşam Memnuniyeti Ölçeği (Ymö) Türkçe Formu: Geçerlik Ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 2015;14(54).
17. Aile T, Bakanlık SP, Üniversitesi H. Türkiye'de Kadına Yönelik Aile İçi Şiddet Araştırması. Ankara: Elma Teknik Basım Matbaası. 2015.
18. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts CH. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet*. 2006;368(9543):1260-1269.
19. Guvenc G, Akyuz A, Cesario SK. Intimate partner violence against women in Turkey: A synthesis of the literature. *J Fam Violence*. 2014;29(3):333-341.
20. Martín-Baena D, Montero-Piñar I, Escribà-Agüir V, Vives-Cases C. Violence against young women attending primary care services in Spain: prevalence and health consequences. *Fam Prac*. 2015;32(4):381-386.
21. Regueira-Diéguez A, Pérez-Rivas N, Muñoz-Barús JI, Vázquez-Portomeña F, Rodríguez-Calvo MS. Intimate partner violence against women in Spain: A medico-legal and criminological study. *J Forensic Leg Med*. 2015;34:119-126.
22. Barnawi FH. Prevalence and risk factors of domestic violence against women attending a primary care center in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *J Interpers Violence*. 2017;32(8):1171-1186.
23. Dalal K, Lindqvist K. A national study of the prevalence and correlates of domestic violence among women in India. *Asia Pac J Public Health*. 2012;24(2):265-277.
24. Nasrabadi AN, Abbasi NH, Mehrdad N. The prevalence of violence against Iranian women and its related factors. *Glob J Health Sci*. 2015;7(3):37.
25. Puri M, Misra G, Hawkes S. Hidden voices: prevalence and risk factors for violence against women with disabilities in Nepal. *BMC public health*. 2015;15(1):261.
26. Neugarten BL, Havighurst RJ, Tobin SS. The measurement of life satisfaction. *J Gerontol*. 1961.
27. Bair-Merritt MH, Blackstone M, Feudtner C. Physical health outcomes of childhood exposure to intimate partner violence: a systematic review. *Pediatrics*. 2006;117(2):e278-e290.
28. Bogat GA, DeJonghe E, Levendosky AA, Davidson WS, von Eye A. Trauma symptoms among infants exposed to intimate partner violence. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2006;30(2):109-125.
29. Dube SR, Anda RF, Felitti VJ, Edwards VJ, Williamson DF. Exposure to abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction among adults who witnessed intimate partner violence as children: implications for health and social services. *Violence Vict*. 2002;17(1):3.
30. Fletcher J. The effects of intimate partner violence on health in young adulthood in the United States. *Soc Sci Med*. 2010;70(1):130-135.
31. Graham-Bermann SA, Howell KH, Miller LE, Kwek J, Lilly MM. Traumatic events and maternal education as predictors of verbal ability for preschool children exposed to intimate partner violence (IPV). *J Fam Violence*. 2010;25(4):383-392.
32. Graham-Bermann SA, Seng J. Violence exposure and traumatic stress symptoms as additional predictors of health problems in high-risk children. *J Pediatr*. 2005;146(3):349-354.
33. Kitzmann KM, Gaylord NK, Holt AR, Kenny ED. Child witnesses to domestic violence: a meta-analytic review. *J Pediatr*; 2003.
34. Moylan CA, Herrenkohl TI, Sousa C, Tajima EA, Herrenkohl RC, Russo MJ. The effects of child abuse and exposure to domestic violence on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *J Fam Violence*. 2010;25(1):53-63.
35. Sousa C, Herrenkohl TI, Moylan CA, Tajima EA, Klika JB, Herrenkohl RC, et al. Longitudinal study on the effects of child abuse and children's exposure to domestic violence, parent-child attachments, and antisocial behavior in adolescence. *J Interpers Violence*. 2011;26(1):111-136.
36. Miller-Graff LE, Cater ÅK, Howell KH, Graham-Bermann SA. Parent-child warmth as a potential mediator of childhood exposure to intimate partner violence and positive adulthood functioning. *Anxiety Stress Coping*. 2016;29(3):259-273.
37. Dhungel S, Dhungel P, Dhital SR, Stock C. Is economic dependence on the husband a risk factor for intimate partner violence against female factory workers in Nepal? *BMC Womens Health*. 2017;17(1):82.
38. Antai D, Antai J, Anthony DS. The relationship between socio-economic inequalities, intimate partner violence and economic abuse: A national study of women in the Philippines. *Glob Public Health*. 2014;9(7):808-826.
39. Vyas S, Jansen HA, Heise L, Mbwambo J. Exploring the association between women's access to economic resources and intimate partner violence in Dar es Salaam and Mbeya, Tanzania. *Soc Sci Med*. 2015;146:307-315.
40. Pantell RH, Child CoPAo, Health F. The child witness in the courtroom. *Pediatrics*. 2017:e20164008.