

## **Investigating Socioeconomic Factors Related to Women's Violence against Their Husbands in Families (Case Study: Married Men in the City of Tabriz)**

PhD Mohammad Abbaszadeh<sup>1</sup>, PhD Kamal Koohi<sup>2</sup>, Pouyan Ehyayi<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>(Department of social sciences, faculty of law and social sciences, university of Tabriz, Tabriz, iran)

<sup>2</sup>(Department of social sciences, faculty of law and social sciences, university of Tabriz, Tabriz, iran.)

<sup>3</sup>(Department of social sciences, M.A. student of Social Sciences Research, faculty of law and social sciences, university of Tabriz, Tabriz, iran.)

---

**ABSTRACT:** *The present research aims at investigating socioeconomic factors related to women's violence against their husbands in the city of Tabriz, Iran. Accordingly, the definition of violence, the domains of violence, and different kinds of violence against men are to be investigated. The method of the research follows a qualitative one and in this term, by relying on Positivism, tries to investigate the mentioned aim among 270 participants selected from among citizens of Tabriz using the multistage sampling method. The results obtained indicated that there is a significant relationship between the degree of couples' education, learning violence in paternal families, the type of marriage, and women's religiosity with husband abuse. In addition, the results obtained from regression analysis indicated that in general, 31% of the variations of the dependent variable (husband abuse) can be explained by variables of learning violence in paternal families, and religiosity.*

**Key words:** *husband abuse, learning and experiencing violence, type of marriage, religiosity, married men.*

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Family violence can be introduced as a set of behaviors to which an individual resort for controlling behaviors and feelings of the other person. For example, appearing critically jealousy behaviors and creating intimation and terror in others which result in the isolation and loneliness in the victim causes that the belligerent one be in the control position of the other individuals in the family. Schehcter&Ganley, by presenting a comprehensive and complete definition of family violence, consider it as "offensive and coercive behaviors such as physical, sexual and psychological attacks and also imposing economic pressures by each adult and young person on the other with who the person has a close relationship" (Pournaghash, 2007: 24).

In the field of research and study, family is a multidimensional reality, in such a way that in different dimensions, its issues are investigable. One of the family phenomena today attracting researchers, sociologist and psychologists is imposing violence in families and a new form of it titled as violence against men in families. Violence can occur both from men against women and vice versa. But, when there is discussion about spouse abuse, harassment, beatings, corporal punishment and the like from men against women come to audiences' minds immediately and it can be represented in such a way that in advance societies of today, it is only women who are harassed. Therefore, due to caring and compassionate, women are considered as poor and oppressed beings versus men who are considered as violent, cruel and heartless. But spouse abuse includes both groups of wives and husbands and in different societies, it is represented in different forms. Each group are imposed by physical and psychological harassments and complains about them.

Among different types of soups abuse, the phenomenon of husband abuse is a common one which cannot be neglected or forgotten and its reasons should be investigated why husbands are harassed, hide violence against themselves, and bear such a situation. Due to hiding this issue and husbands' not referring to judicial authorities and other related institutions, there is no accurate estimation of the real degree of husband abuse in societies. In general, information in this regard indicates that husband battering, as wife battering is a serious problem and has the same importance. Studies conducted in recent years indicate the closeness of the prevalence of this violence along with women abuse (Gelles, 1977: 431-432). The mentioned cases show the

significance of this issue; for example, GhasemiRoshan (2003) and Joanne et al. (2006), in their researches investigated ethology of harassments against husbands and the results obtained from their exploratory studies illustrate this issue that at the present time, husband abuse has been expanded in different societies due to the establishment of feminist movements and the influence and expansion of feminist theorists' ideas. Samadi Rad et al. (2007) recorded a case of husband abuse in the City of Tabriz which was in the form of feeding husbands with capsules containing tacks during a few days. The women causing the violence had a record of violence in her previous marriage. The results of the research indicated that factors such as motivations for accessing the husband's properties was the reason of the violence. In addition, Lisa (1990) and Suzanne and Joseph (1988) investigated imposing physical and verbal violence of women against their husbands. Among other important research in this regard is the investigation of the effect of social and cultural structure of a society and women's access to valuable resources and power in the society (Medina & Barberet, 2003 and Fortune & Enger, 2005). In fact, the present study is to find an answer for this question that firstly, to what extent is the degree of husband abuse in the population of the study? In addition, which factors are more effective on the mentioned case? For find answers for these questions, a review on the conducted research in this regard seems necessary.

## **II. BODY TEXT**

### **2.1. Homogamy Theory**

This theory considers family strength due to the existence of homogenous characteristic among wives and husbands. Homology among two people not only attract themselves toward each other, but also it makes their bond firmer. In other words, anisotropy between two spouses is the origin of family conflicts. According to Hill, individuals tend to select a spouse who is their homogenous one rather than heterogeneous one. If such a belief is not obeyed due to some reasons, likely the couple faces conflicts and then divorce. Wood in his work, marriage from a religious viewpoint, believes that the less the homogeneity between the two partners in terms of religion and ideological commitments, the more their conflicts and differences (Saroukhani, 2006: 40).

Homogamy has different indices among which one can refer to age, academic homology, homology in professional status, homology in social classes, homology in parents' financial status, homology in religion, cultural and ethnic homology, and etc. the closer these indices to each other is, the more successful this the life of couples will be according to this theory; otherwise, violence against each other is possible (Pour Arghandi et al. 2011: 45).

### **2.2 Social Learning Theory**

Social learning theory emphasizes the mutual effects between behaviors and the environment; it concentrates on behavioral patterns which individuals grow for coping with their own environment. These are patters which are acquired via direct experiences of individuals' responses or observing others' responses (Salimi and Davari, 2007: 403).

In 1990's, Albert Bandura declared that violence is a kind of acquired social behavior. The prevalence of violence usually will be conducted under direct effect (punishment or encouragement) of individual observations and the results of personal experiences are taken from the results related to others' behaviors. For changing an observed behavior to a personal one, it is necessary that the behavior should be established in individuals' minds and then, it is changed into a practical behavior. Although the roots of violence is very expansive according to this theory, Bandura concentrates on three certain patterns of family, secondary groups such as peers, and culture (including mass media) in learning violent behaviors (Braithwaite & Baxter, 2006: 262).

Social learning theory assumes that observation and experience of violence in childhood (in families or societies) is a dangerous action for violence. Violence committed by individuals in their adulthood have roots in their childhood and even it has been claimed that violence bears violence (The Circulation of Violence Theory). If the environment of the family is the ground of conflicts and violence, it has a definite role in the production of violent behavior and makes the circulation of violence prolonged (Sa'adati, 2011: 52).

### **2.3. The Theory of Resources**

The Theory of Resources is one of the first theories presented by William Good in the field of family violence. From the perspective of theorists of resources, the balance between wives and husbands has a close relationship with resources which one of them brings with him/herself to the family. According to this theory, there is a direct relationship between wives' socioeconomic status and their power in the structure of families. Therefore, the lower wives' socioeconomic status compared to that of their husbands, the more the dictatorship and sexual inequality; therefore, wives are put aside from the field of decision making. When wives have more resources than their husbands do, their power for imposing their wants increase. This increase in their power can occur in the process of decision making well (Ezazi, 2001: 81). Wives who enjoy higher socioeconomic statuses than their husbands do, take part in decision making more; in other words, if wives' resources increase, their power increases as well. Surely, in this situation, the displacement in the distribution of power is not compatible with patriarchic beliefs in the society. Therefore, the more wives access to resources such as income and education than their husbands do, the more the traditional norms are refuted and the more wives oppose the masculine domination (Haarr, 2007: 248).

As discussed, from among different kinds of spouse abuse, the phenomenon of husband abuse is a common phenomenon so that one cannot neglect it. Nowadays, by the advancement in technologies and the increase in women's knowledge and education regarding their own rights, it can be said that the phenomenon of spouse abuse includes the state of both partners and factors such as violence, religiosity, and other factors are involved in this issue. This issue can be observed not only in Iran, but all over the world and in different human societies; therefore, to explicate the present issue theoretically and experimentally, the theory of resources for investigating socioeconomic factors and husband abuse, the theory of homogamy for investigating the relationship of religiosity and husband abuse, and the theory of social learning presented by Bandura for studying the relationship of husband abuse with learning and experiencing violence, as well as similar results from researches conducted in this regard were used for enriching the present study.

### 2.4. Research hypotheses

1. The mean scores of husband abuse among married men is different from each other in terms of their wives' levels of education.
2. The mean scores of husband abuse among married men is different from each other in terms of the types their jobs.
3. The mean scores of husband abuse among married men is different from each other in terms of the types of their marriage.
4. There is a correlation between wives' adherence to religious beliefs and the degree of husband abuse in families.
5. There is a correlation between wives' observation and learning violence in families and husband abuse.

## III. METHODS

The present study is a survey one which can be considered as a widely-scoped research. In addition, according to the criterion of time, this research is a cross-sectional one because it was conducted in 2014. To collect data, a closed-ended fixed item questionnaire (in the framework of Likert scale) and to analyze data, SPSS software were used. The population includes all married men in the City of Tabriz as they were 1457339 individuals according to the latest census in 2011. Using Cochran's formula, the sample size was estimated to be equal as 270 participants. To select this number, stratified random sampling method was used. According to this method, in 10 areas of the Municipality of Tabriz City, proportionate to the population of each area, copies of the questionnaire were distributed and then collected.

### 3.1. Validity and reliability of questionnaire

To evaluate the variable of husband abuse, 30 six option items were designed in the framework of Likert scale. To divide and categorize the 30 items related to husband abuse, the factor analysis technique which is based on dividing the variable into main components was used. According to the results of this tests, the value of KMO is 0.96 and because this value is higher than 0.6; therefore, it can be concluded that the number of samples is appropriate for conducting the factor analysis technique. In addition, the value of Bartlett's test with significance level 0.000 indicates that dividing factors was conducted appropriately and the questions put in each factor have high root correlations with each other. In general, all four mentioned factors with specific values higher than one could explain about 80% of the variance of the variable of husband abuse. Factor loadings were rotated using the Varimax method. In addition, analyzing the reliability of items of each of the dimensions of husband abuse and wives' religious adherence as well as learning violence indicates high internal reliability between the investigated items.

**Table 1: the results of factor analysis and reliability analysis of items related to the variable of husband abuse**

Variable	Dimension		Weight factor	Explained variance	Eigenvalues	Cronbach's alpha	Total Cronbach's alpha
husband abuse	Psychological husband abuse	Shouting, loud talking	0.77	57.93	8.15	0.73	0.97
		Insults and threats and curses out	0.82				
		disrespectful look and assigning inappropriate attributes	0.80				
		Despising pride and character	0.79				
		Despising the appearance of a person's body	0.80				
		Humiliation and insult to the husbands' friends and acquaintances	0.83				
		Removing the sanctity of father before children	0.81				
		Blame, humiliation and criticism of husband	0.81				

	Physical husband abuse	Damaging the reputation of husband	0.83	11.09	6.73	0.76		
		Humiliating interests and ideas	0.81					
		Pushing while quarrelling	0.78					
		Beating and kicking	0.82					
		Slap in the face	0.85					
		Pulling up hair or dress	0.85					
		Spitting	0.80					
		Knocking and bruising the husband's body	0.84					
		Attacking by equipment's with in home	0.82					
	Waking up from sleep deliberately and repeatedly	0.75						
	Financial husband abuse	Checking husbands' routine money	0.76	8.027	5.54			
		Splurging as objection	0.78					
		Threatening husbands to receive alimony and dowry	0.77					
		Biased evaluation of the financial accounts	0.79					
		Being greed on supplying home necessary thing	0.80					
		Extravagance in the purchase of goods	0.77					
		Selling home facilities	0.75					
	Sexual husband abuse	Unwillingness to have sex	0.82	5.12	4.22	0.83		
		Humiliating expression of dissatisfaction in sex	0.81					
		Reluctance and disappointment in sexual intercourse	0.79					
Forced to have sex by force		0.82						
Lack of attention to the needs and interests of husband in sexual intercourse		0.79						
KMO = 0.962			BTS = 2135.5			Sig = 0.000		

Table 2: the results of Chronabch's alpha coefficient of independent variables

Variable	Number of items	Chronabch's alpha coefficient
Learning violence	5	0.93
Religiosity	5	0.98

## 1.2. Conceptual and operational definitions of research variables

**3.2.1 Dependent variable (husband abuse):** it refer to wives' annoying behaviors against their husbands which violate their rights and occur in the family environment (GhassemiRoshan, 2003: 6). The operational definition of husband abuse can be investigated from four dimensions:

**3.2.1.1 Psychological husband abuse:** some of types of violence committed by wives can harm their husbands' souls and press them psychologically. Usually, this kind of husband abuse is more common and can indirectly result in destructive effects (Kraj, 2002: 52). The mentioned item, by indicators such as destruction of husbands' dignity and pride, breaking fathers' dignity and respect in the eyes of their children, breaking their pride and dignity, cursing and swearing at husbands, assigning inappropriate attributes to them, inattention to their wants and expectations, discriminations between wives' families and those of their husbands, inappropriate comparison of their husbands with other men, magnification minor issues, cynicism and suspicion was measured.

**3.2.1.2 Physical husband abuse:** this issue is mostly observable in families which wives have more domination and power. In these families, wives take the main role in families and expect that other members of the family accept their decisions and respect them. In addition, in cases which wives feel that their commands are not obeyed by husbands, they feel that they have this right to have physical contention with them (GhassemiRoshan, 2003: 50). The mentioned item can be measured using indicators such as Beating, biting, handing down, slapping, etc.

**3.2.1.3 Financial husband abuse:** another type of annoying husbands has economic nature mainly including checking unallowably and destructing husbands' properties (GhassemiRoshan, 2003: 52). The mentioned item can be measured using indicators such as donating husbands' property to relatives and the needy without consultation and information, Unlawful seizure of husbands' property, and prodigality which is among wives' economic battering including the waste of food and clothing and splurging things for showing their protests.

**3.2.1.4 Sexual husband abuse:** Satisfy husbands' sexual needs for preventing their infidelity which sometimes avoiding satisfaction of this need results in the annoyance of husbands and provides the ground for men's meeting other women, instinctive stimulation and emotional problems (Joanne et al., 2006: 375). The mentioned item can be measured using indicators such as unreasonable sexual deprivation, sexual reluctance, cold collisions in intercourses, inattention to bodily healthcare, and doing intercourse reluctantly.

### 1.3. Independent variables

**3.3.1 Level of education:** by levels of education, it means that the time each one of partners has spent for learning knowledge according to the official educational system in Iran. This variable can be measured in ordinal levels with options such as primary school, secondary school, diploma, associate diploma, BA, MA, and higher levels.

**3.3.2 Employment status:** work can be defined as a set of tasks requiring intellectual and physical efforts and their aims is to produce goods and services need by human beings. Job or profession are the activities for which salaries are paid (Giddens, 2009: 516-517).

**3.3.3 Types of marriage:** it means that the marriage is mandatory or optional.

**3.3.4 Religiosity:** refer to belief in metaphysical powers and observing a set of moral principles regarding relations with oneself, other God's slaves, and performing religious rituals for being close to God and attaining His satisfaction for the happiness of one's soul (Ketabi et al. 2004: 172). To measure this item, Likert scale was used. This instrument meant to measure how much they have adherence to religious beliefs (very low, low, moderate, high, and very high).

**3.3.5 Observation and experience of violence in families:** this variable refers to every kind of battering Committed during childhood by one of the parents against a woman, or observation of her father beating and disrespecting her mother or vice versa (Sa'adati, 2011: 127). This variable can be used for measuring the degree of violence experienced by wives and husbands in their paternal families. It can be measured by indicators such as verbal struggles, limitation of meetings, respecting, controlling telephone communications, being unkind towards husbands, inattention to women's ideas, disrespecting husbands, and shouting when parents are present.

## IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The data obtained from table 3 indicates that regarding the fact that the mean scores obtained for the variable of husband abuse as 70.93 is less than the value of the range mean scores; therefore, it can be said that respondents have moderate to low degrees of husband abuse. The data obtained from the table indicates that the degree of psychological, sexual, and physical husband abuse is moderate to low levels, but the degree of financial husband abuse with mean scores 26.85 is higher than the range mean scores and the respondents have experienced moderate to high levels of financial husband abuse. The degree of learning violence is evaluated to be at moderate to low levels, while the variable of religiosity with mean scores as 22.50, due to being higher than the range mean scores, shows moderate to high levels of wives' religiosity.

**Table 3: descriptive statistics of research variables**

Variables	Range of variations	Min.	Max.	SD	Range mean scores	Obtained mean scores	Skewness
husband abuse	150	30	180	36.7	105	70.93	0.56
Psychological husband abuse	50	10	60	16	35	6.41	0.66
Physical husband abuse	40	8	48	9.24	28	14.78	1.45
Sexual husband abuse	25	5	30	6.42	17.5	10.06	1.28
Financial husband abuse	35	7	42	12.4	24.5	26.58	0.49
Learning violence	25	5	30	6.30	17.5	10.43	1.11
Religiosity	25	5	30	7.27	17.5	22.50	-0.91

The data obtained from table 6 indicate that the degrees of husband abuse are different from each other in terms of husbands' types of marriage and the mean scores of husband's abuse for men with mandatory marriage was 73.6 and for men with optional marriage was 70.6. It means that men who have mandatory marriage have experienced more husband abuse than those with optional marriage have. In addition, the results indicate that husbands' being self-employed or having state job have no effect on the degree of husband abuse.

**Table 4: the analytical results of relationships among ground variables and husband abuse**

Ground variables		Types of marriage		Spouses' jobs	
		Mandatory	Optional	State	Self-employed
Husband abuse	Mean scores	73.6	70.6	25.63	25.12
	Sig.	0.02		0.208	

The mean scores of husband abuse is different among men in terms of their levels of education. Regarding the level of evaluating husband battering and wives' levels of education, ANOVA (F) was used. The obtained results indicate that the mean scores of husband abuse was different in terms of levels of education. It means that the wives of men who had high levels of education had experienced more degrees of husband abuse than those with lower levels of education. Mentioned cases were confirmed via follow-up LSD test.

**Table 5: the results of ANOVA of husband abuse in terms of education**

Independent variable groups (levels of education)	Mean scores	ANOVA	
Primary school	68.9	f-value	2.57
Secondary school	69.1		
Diploma	67.3		
Associate diploma	71.9	Sig.	0.03
BA	77.5		
MA and higher	78.2		

To test the relationship of variables of learning violence and religiosity with husband abuse, Pearson correlation was used. The results indicate that the two variables of learning violence and religiosity have significant correlation with each other at significance level 95%. However, the variable of religiosity has a negative correlation with husband abuse. It means that the more the degree of religiosity among wives in the study, the less the degree of their husband abuse and vice versa. In addition, there is a positive correlation between the variable of learning violence and husband abuse. It means that the more the degree of learning violence, the more the degree of husband abuse and vice versa.

**Table 6: the results of Pearson Correlation test**

Investigating the relationships among variables	Magnitude of correlation	Sig.	The results of testing hypotheses
Relationship between husband abuse and learning violence	0.52**	0.000	Temporally accepted
Relationship between husband abuse and religiosity	-0.73**	0.000	Temporally accepted

At last, after doing correlation analysis of variables, the fit of goodness of the regression model was conducted by controlling its presumptions. The value of Durbin-Watson test which tests the hypothesis of independence of errors or remainders, the range of this quantity is from 0 to 4, and usually, the range from 1.5 to 2.5 is acceptable and indicates the independence of remainders from each other. In the present study, the value of Durbin-Watson test was 1.54 which indicates that remainders are independent of each other. The F-value indicates the existence of a linear correlation between variables. Furthermore, the value of VIF test is in the acceptable range (lower than 2.5), it means that there is no significant correlation between predictor variables in the research. Therefore, the pre-assumption of the absence of multicollinearity correlation among predictor variables can be confirmed. In terms of mentioned cases, the results obtained from the stepwise regression model indicate that the variables of experiencing and learning variables and religiosity were entered the final model and the adjusted explanation coefficient indicates that 31% of the variations of the independent variable was explained by mentioned variables. In addition, standard beta coefficient indicate this issue that per each unit increase in the variable of religiosity, the degree of husband abuse decrease as -0.18 unit, and the variable of husband abuse is more influenced by the variable of experiencing and learning violence. In other words, per each unit increase in the variable of experiencing and learning violence, the variable of husband abuse increases with the coefficient as 0.56.

**Table 7: the results of multivariate regression analysis of the variable of husband abuse**

Variable	Beta	T	Sig.	Coefficient of determination	0.32
Experiencing and learning violence	0.56	11.08	0.000	Adjusted coefficient of determination	0.31
Religiosity	-0.18	-4.08	0.000	Durbin-Watson value	1.54
Variance analysis				f-value	62.34
				sig.	0.000

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the present study, the investigation of socioeconomic factors related to wives' violence against their husbands in families was conducted among the men of Tabriz Metropolis. With a general overview of social, population, family, and economic characteristics of this city, it is inferred that it has a context and structure of passing from traditional to modern ways of life and the entrance of women into social and academic fields, the increase in women's knowledge and education and in line with it, feminist challenges of women for attaining their lost rights and well as their campaigns in this regard are represented in different forms. According to the primary and exploratory studies conducted in this regard, it can be said that the phenomenon of spouse battering includes both spouses and in different societies, direct and indirect instance of husband abuse can be daily observed. As a result, investigating family violence among families in this city is a necessity. It should be noted that regarding the explanation of family violence, different ideas have been presented and each of them indicates some part of the reality. In the present study, homogamy theory, learning violence theory, and at last, resources theory were utilized. In addition, using the survey technique and by designing items in this regard, required data were collected from the female participants. Inferential analysis of the data indicates the confirmation of presented hypothesis with high degree of confidence. Therefore, the variables of wives' levels of education, experiencing and learning violence, the types of marriage, and religiosity are effective on aggressive behaviors of wives against their husbands.

According to the results obtained from testing hypotheses, a reverse and significant correlation was observed between religiosity and husband abuse. Accordingly, the more the degree of religiosity, the less the degree of wives' violence against their husbands. According to the homogamy theory, the more the couples are consistent in religion and other factors, the more successful they are. Otherwise, the possibility of committing violence against each other is available.

There is a direct and significant correlation between the variable of observing violence in parental families with wives' violence against their husbands. It means that the more the degree of observing violence in parental families is, the more the degree of wives' violence against their husbands in families is and vice versa. This result confirms the ideas of the social learning theory. Bandura states that violence is a kind of learned social behavior. Learning violence usually is influenced directly (encouragement or punishment) by personal observation and the results of personal experience are taken from the results related to the behaviors of other people. To change an observed behavior into a personal one, it is necessary that that behavior be established in individuals' minds and then, it can be changed into a practical one. According to Bandura, children, by observing their parents' behaviors, learn how to commit violence. Observing misbehavior from parents in childhood will result in learning dominant behaviors by individuals and learning different kinds of violence.

As a result, the present variables could explain 31% of the variations of the variable of husband abuse in the population. It is expected that other researchers can analyze new variables in order to be able to investigate this emerging phenomenon in a better way. The final word is that according to the present study, if we want to reduce the irrational husband as an abnormal phenomenon within families, it is necessary that families and particularly wives and husbands should be taught via visual and verbal media, books, journals, and etc. the required warnings (such as paying attention to the types of marriage and giving independence of thoughts to couples because in a near future, it will be possible that a hard and devastating fight can undermine families' stability and consequently, social development. Because families are pillars of societies and if they are harmed, the whole society can be affected.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Pour Naghash, S. "Investigating and comparing different types of family violence in women and men of Tehran". *Proceeding of Psychology*.2007,26-30.
- [2] Gelles, R. J. "The violent home a study of physical aggression between husbands and wives", *Journal of marriage and the family*, Vol.39, No. 2,1977 , 431-434.
- [3] GhassemiRoshan, E. "Husband abuse, abuse against husband's behaviors", *Journal of Women Strategic Studies*, No. 20, 2003,43-68 (Persian).
- [4] Joanne C. Minaker, Laureen Snider, Husband Abuse: Equality with a Vengeance?, *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice/La Revue canadienne de criminologie et de justice pénale*, Issue . 48( 5) .2006 , 753-780
- [5] Samadi Rad, B., et al. "Reporting a rare case of husband abuse", *Journal of Forensic Medicine*, 13(4), 2007, 261-264 (Persian).
- [6] Lisa D. Brush, Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households, *Gender and Society Journal*, 4 (1),1990,56-67.
- [7] Suzanne K. Steinmetz, Joseph S. Lucca, Husband Battering,(Ed.)*Handbook of Family Violence*,1988, 233-246.
- [8] Medina, J. &Braberet.Intimate Partner Violence in Spain. Findings Form a National Survey, *Violence against Women*, 9: 2003,302-322.
- [9] Fortune, M. &Enger J. *Violence against Women and the Role of Religion*.(Retrieved January 7, 2007).
- [10] Saroukhani, B. *An introduction to the sociology of families*.(Tehran: Soroush Publication2006).
- [11] Pour Arghanid, H. et al. Family violence against women: a review over theories, the degree of prevalence and factors affecting it. *Journal of School of Nursing and Midwifery*, ShahidBeheshti University of Medical Sciences and Health Services. 21( 73).2011, 44-52.
- [12] Salimi, A. and Davari, M. *Sociology of violation*. (Tehran: HozeH and University Research Institute 2007).
- [13] Braithwait, D. & Baxter, L. *engaging theories in family communication*.(London: sage publications,2006).
- [14] Sa'adati, M. *Investigating the relationship between social capital on mental health and domestic violence*. (MA thesis, Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, University of Tabriz ,2011) (Persian).
- [15] Ezazi, Sh. *Family violence against battered women*, (Tehran: Sali Publication,2001) (Persian).
- [16] Haarr, R. N. "Wife Abuse in Tajikistan", *Feminist criminology*, No. 2, (2007), 245-261.
- [17] Kraj, Zh. *Psychological diseases*, Translatedby: M. Mansour and P. Dadsetan(Tehran: Roshd Publication 2002). (Persian).
- [18] Giddens, A. *Sociology*, Translated by: M. Sabouri, (Tehran: Nei 2009)(Persian).
- [19] Ketabi, M. et al.Religion, social capital and sociocultural development. *University of Isfahan Journal*.17( 2). 2004, 169-192.