OCCASIONAL PAPER

72

Abused but 'Not Insulted': Understanding Intersectionality in Symbolic Violence in India

Simantini Mukhopadhyay

Trisha Chanda

March 2021

INSTITUTE OF DEVELOPMENT STUDIES KOLKATA

DD 27/D, Sector I, Salt Lake, Kolkata 700 064

Phone : +91 33 2321-3120/21 Fax : +91 33 2321-3119

E-mail : idsk@idskmail.com, Website: www.idsk.edu.in

Abused but 'Not Insulted': Understanding Intersectionality in Symbolic Violence in India

Simantini Mukhopadhyay[1]
Trisha Chanda[2]

Abstract
The latest round of the Indian National Family Health Survey shows that more than one-fourth of the women in India who have experienced spousal bodily violence say that they never felt insulted by the action of their husbands. We hypothesize that this absence of the feeling of insult despite facing bodily violence indicates the presence of symbolic violence, which manifests through symbolic channels and cannot be realized without the complicity of the victim. Feminist writing in India has argued that gender needs to be considered at its intersection with class and caste to understand how the control of female sexuality relates to the organization of production, sanctioned and legitimized by ideologies. Running instrumental variable probit regression, we find that once the experience of bodily violence is controlled for, women from non-poor upper caste households are significantly less likely to have felt insulted, as compared to women from other social groups.

Keywords: spousal violence, symbolic violence, insult, caste, class, intersectionality

JEL Classification: J12, J16

1. Assistant Professor, Institute of Development Studies Kolkata. Email: simantinihalder@gmail.com
2. PhD Student, University of Wisconsin-Madison. Email: trishachanda13@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The fourth and latest round of the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4) conducted in 2015-16 in India shows that one-third of the country's women, who are or were ever married and are currently in the reproductive age group, report to have experienced spousal violence. One out of four women reported having faced spousal 'physical' (but not 'sexual') violence. 1 percent reported having faced sexual (but not 'physical') violence and 5 percent reported having faced both. 14 percent said that they were emotionally abused by their husbands (IIPS and ICF 2017) The figures on domestic violence against women in India are higher than those of most other developing countries in South Asia (UN Women 2020).

There is a rich volume of literature highlighting that data on domestic violence are almost always likely to be underreported. This is largely due to the normalization of domestic violence in traditional societies. According to the NFHS-4 Report, the proportion of women who felt that wife-beating was justified (52%) exceeded the proportion of men who felt so (42%) in India in 2005-16 (IIPS and ICF 2017). In his 1869 classic essay, *The Subjection of Women*, John Stuart Mill criticized the common perception that the rule of men dominating women was not "a rule of force", since it was "accepted voluntarily" by women who made "no complaint", and were "consenting parties to it" (Mill 1869: p. 24). He argued that while many women actually protested against male domination, there were many others who silently cherished similar aspirations. He further conjectured that the number of women who "would cherish them, were they not so strenuously taught to repress them as contrary to the proprieties of their sex" was even greater (Mill 1869: p. 26). More than a century later, Sen (1995) wrote about the perceived legitimacy of gender inequalities within the household, noting that patriarchal institutions thrive by "making allies" out of women–the ones who have "most to lose from such arrangements" (p. 260). On a similar note, (Nussbaum 2005) discusses that one of the worst

repercussions of violence against women is to enlist women themselves as “accomplices”. Victims of domestic violence may feel the physical pain, without experiencing the mental agony that comes with a perception of one’s rights being violated. Some forms of violence may not be recognized as “violence at all” to a woman, who has been “thoroughly taught” to accept it as women’s fate (Nussbaum, 2005: p. 175).

This may be interpreted with reference to Pierre Bourdieu’s “paradox of doxa”, the fact that the established order of the world (“with its one-way streets and its no-entry signs”) is broadly accepted and respected, such that even “the most intolerable conditions of existence” are often “perceived as acceptable and natural” (Bourdieu 2001: p.1). Masculine domination, which is sustained through such a paradox, results from what Bourdieu terms as “symbolic violence” (p. 2). This form of violence operates through symbolic channels (such as language and lifestyle) and is imperceptible even to the dominated or the victim (Bourdieu, 2001). Krais (1993) points out that this “subtle, euphemized, invisible” form of violence (p. 172), though misrecognized by the victim, is socially recognized and accepted. Symbolic violence cannot be realized without the complicity of the dominated. Nevertheless, Bourdieu (2001: p34) cautions that it would be naïve to understand symbolic violence as “spiritual violence”, the opposite of actual bodily violence, bereft of any “real effect”. Agarwal (1997) illustrates that in the context of gender relations and women’s bargaining power within and outside the household, “doxa” would correspond to the existing social norms and practices around gender. Mukhopadhyay (2017) argues that the public discourse on domestic violence in India has excessively focused on “visible external injuries on the female body”. While bodily injuries are the outcomes of certain violent “acts”, the experience of domestic violence is generally a process of sustained, symbolic domination.

Another important issue here is that women’s experiences and

responses vary across the social spectrum at the intersections of gender with the other dimensions of social power such as class and race (caste in the Indian context). Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” (Crenshaw 1989) to challenge the mainstream discourse that looked at identity categories across single axes of social power as “vestiges of bias or domination” and overlooked differences within such categories (Crenshaw 1991). Failing to recognize intra-group differences would be detrimental in the context of violence against women since the experience of violence is often shaped by the simultaneous and complex interactions of the other identities of women, namely class and race, Crenshaw (1991) argued. Feminist writing in India has likewise argued that gender needs to be considered at its intersection with class and caste (a stratification unique to India) to understand how the control of female sexuality relates to the organization of production, sanctioned and legitimized by certain ideologies (Chakravarti, 2018/2003). Agarwal (1997) argues that in certain regions of South Asia, the “class factor” determines what women perceive as self-interest, distinct from that of the household. While studies addressing the issue of intersectional inequalities have mostly adopted qualitative methods, quantitative attempts to measure and understand intersectionality (mainly in the context of health outcomes) have been recent and few (Sen, Iyer, and Mukherjee 2009).

In this paper, we use the difference between two types of self-reported experience of spousal violence by women (bodily (physical and sexual) and emotional) as the vantage point of our analysis. This is done to address the issue of normalization of spousal violence and symbolic domination. Surveys collecting data on domestic violence (large scale surveys such as the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) conducted in various countries, including the Indian NFHS and small scale surveys in different localized settings) typically ask questions on physical, sexual and emotional violence and studies analyzing these surveys often end up in finding the ‘determinants’ or ‘correlates’

of ‘any’ violence (meaning the union of the different types of violence) or ‘each type of’ violence (Tenkorang et al. 2013; Ahmad, Khan, and Mozumdar 2019; Jungari and Chinchore 2020). However, feminist scholars have shown that bodily violence often results in a fuzzy understanding of the victim about her body and her “separative self” and the perception of the violator’s autonomy or identity (Nedelsky 1990). It may even lead to aggression on one’s own self such as suicide, self-harm, denial of food or negligence of diseases (Karlekar 1998). Many studies discuss that physical violence lowers the victim’s self-esteem and confidence (Hilberman and Munson 1977; Agarwal and Panda 2007; DeRiviere 2008). Reviewing the literature in the Indian context, we find that though women who experience physical violence are more likely to have poorer mental health outcomes (Kumar et al. 2005), emotional violence inflicted by the husband is often misrecognized (Mukhopadhyay 2017) and is acknowledged only in extreme circumstances, such as when the woman dies (Lodhia 2009).

In this paper, we address the interconnectedness of bodily and emotional violence, starting from the normative position that a woman who reports to have experienced bodily violence from her husband must also report having felt insulted or made to feel bad about herself. We test this hypothesis using the NFHS questions on bodily violence, which are direct in spirit and focus on the husband’s action, and those on emotional violence, which stress on how the woman felt, irrespective of the particular act of the husband leading her to feel so. The NFHS questionnaire thus enables us to find out empirically, if facing bodily violence necessarily leads to a feeling of insult. We assume that the absence of such a feeling would confirm that there is symbolic violence, with women accepting male domination as the norm. Though sociologists have discussed the importance of understanding intersectional positionalities of women in studying their experiences of violence, we are not aware of any previous attempt to capture this quantitatively.

Controlling for women's experience of bodily violence, we examine in what kind of intersectional social settings they are more likely to not feel insulted. In other words, we try to find out the simultaneous and complex interactions of caste and class in shaping symbolic violence.

We use the framework of the familiar bargaining model of household utility maximization. To address the issue of endogeneity of variables we use instrumental variables for bodily violence to assess their effect on the feeling of insult (Tauchen et al., 1991; Farmer & Tiefenthaler, 1997).

2. Background

The Economics of Intimate Partner Violence

Following Gary Becker's seminal work on the economic analysis of the family (Becker 1965), a host of initial studies in 'New Home Economics' treated the family as a co-operative unit comprising members with altruistic preferences. Time and goods were allocated between members following the maximization of the common or unitary household utility. Co-operative bargaining models followed, where spouses (or partners) were assumed to have differing preferences and 'threat points', meaning utility from staying within the marriage for each spouse would have to equal at least the utility that they would obtain from its dissolution (Manser and Brown 1980; McElroy and Horney 1981; Folbre 1986). Non-co-operative models, however, were more suited to the analysis of spousal violence (Tauchen, Witte, and Long 1991; Farmer and Tiefenthaler 1997). Tauchen, Witte, and Long (1991) modeled how the marginal utility of violence for the male partner varied with changes in his relative bargaining power. For instance, a rise in the woman's income increased her reservation utility and her threat point. Farmer and Tiefenthaler (1997) use a game-theoretic model of strategic interactions between partners in a violent relationship, where apart from income, a woman's threat point is also affected by environmental factors determining

her options outside the partnership. They start with a simple model where the husband chooses the level of violence and the net transfers to his wife. In abusive relationships, the man derives utility from committing violence since it boosts his self-esteem and sense of powerfulness. While both spouses' utilities are modeled as functions of individual consumption, violence committed (of course in opposite directions) and marital capital (the spouses derive utility from it only as long as the marriage exists), the man's utility also features as an argument in the woman's utility function. This is because women often stay in abusive relationships due to their love for the abusers (Farmer and Tiefenthaler 1997). The husband chooses those levels of consumption and violence which maximize his utility, subject to the budget constraint and the constraint that his wife's utility equals her reservation utility so that she stays in the marriage. Thus, violence chosen depends not only on income and marital capital (e.g. the number of children), but also on environmental factors which determine the woman's prospects outside the marriage.

Despite their wide applications, one critique of these models is that they consider threat points as exogenous and static while in reality, threat points keep changing as the woman's self-esteem diminishes with increasing frequency and intensity of violence (DeRiviere 2008).

Intersectionality

To understand the stratification of gender along the axes of caste and class in India, (Chakravarti, 2018/2003) refers to Gerda Lerner's pioneering work on the intersection of class and gender. Lerner (1986) found that in early Mesopotamia, while women from different economic classes enjoyed varying degrees of economic freedom, the control of men over female sexuality pervaded class. Thus, she argued that instead of looking at naive economic questions, which address only the organization and control of the production process, an understanding of the dynamics of

power in the context of reproduction would be more meaningful (Lerner 1986). Chakravarti (1993; 2018/2003) invokes a similar framework in the Indian context to understand the intersections of caste, class and gender, where female sexuality features as the key input in the process of reproduction. The social order of "Brahmanical Patriarchy" in India has sanctioned and reinforced the subordination of women and the lower castes. The caste system, which is essentially a system of labor appropriation, formulated codes for gender to serve the motives of the upper caste male. Caste and gender are inextricably linked, since the control of the sexuality of the upper caste Hindu woman is imperative not only for preserving patrilineal succession but also for maintaining caste purity through endogamy. Brahmanical patriarchy rests on its acceptance by women, through the ideology of Streedharma or Pativrata, adhering to which Hindu upper caste women consider their husbands their careers and chastity and wifely fidelity the ultimate goals of existence. Chakravarti (1993) calls this "the masterstroke of Hindu Aryan genius", since this became one of the most successful models of patriarchy, with women themselves controlling their sexuality and succumbing to male domination. One may theorize this using Bourdieu's conceptualization of the paradox of doxa. Women's cooperation to preserve the order of property and status was ensured by ideologies, their lack of economic power, class privileges and "finally the use of force when required" (Chakravarti 1993). Chakravarti (2018/2003) discusses how the lower castes, particularly those with aspirations of upward social mobility, often emulate the codes of Brahmanical Patriarchy in modern India.

On the other hand, there has been a paucity of dialogue between theorists and empirical researchers in global intersectional scholarship. Sociologists lament that empirical work in this field often comprises balkanized research, considering the effects of multiple oppressions as additive (Weber and Parra-Medina 2003). Nevertheless, recent quantitative studies use innovative

and simple methods to capture the simultaneous and complex interactions of the different vestiges of power, treating the intersectional social spectrum as a mix of advantages and disadvantages (Sen, Iyer, and Mukherjee 2009; Chakraborty and Mukhopadhayay 2017; Mukhopadhyay and Chakraborty 2018).

3. Data and Methods

Data

We use data from the fourth and latest round of the Indian NFHS, conducted in 2015-16. Standardized questionnaires, sample designs and field procedures are used, following the general DHS format. In each Indian state, the rural sample is selected in two and three stages in rural and urban areas respectively. The Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) are villages in rural areas and municipal wards in urban areas. The NFHS covers a nationally representative sample of women aged between 15 and 49 years. The module on domestic violence was administered to 83,397 women, and data was missing for 17,384 women. We use sample weights, specific to the estimation of domestic violence, as provided in NFHS-4.

Variables

Dependent Variables

We take two indicators of bodily violence, physical and sexual. The indicator for emotional violence is having felt insulted or made to feel bad about oneself. The NFHS questionnaire contains two other questions on emotional violence, namely if the respondent felt humiliated by her husband in front of others and if she felt threatened that she or her close ones would be harmed by her husband. The DHS manual clearly states that unlike the questions on bodily violence, the thrust of these questions is not on the particular action of the husband, but on the perception and feeling of the respondent. However, we do not consider the variables on humiliation and threat since bodily

violence is neither necessary nor sufficient for these. Instead, we begin from the normative position that bodily violence is a sufficient condition (though not necessary) for feeling insulted or being made to feel bad about one's own self.

We have three dependent variables, which are dummy variables indicating whether the respondent has reported to have faced bodily violence (physical and sexual) or has felt insulted. The variables on bodily violence are coded from a series of questions in the NFHS data pertaining to acts of physical or sexual violence and take a value of one when the respondent has answered in the affirmative to any or all the questions in the series for a specific form of violence . The third dependent variable in our analysis takes a value of one when respondents report having felt insulted or being made to feel bad about herself by her husband.

Independent Variables

Extending on Tauchen, Witte, and Long (1991), and Farmer and Tiefenthaler (1997) and drawing from the literature on the demand function for health which also uses the framework of household choice behavior (Thomas et al. 2017), we classify our independent variables into 5 categories: a) marital capital, b) woman's background characteristics, c) husband's background characteristics, d) household characteristics and e) environmental factors. Marital capital includes duration of marriage, total children born to the respondent and her husband, number of children born during the last five years, and if the marriage was consanguineous. We include the woman's age, education, employment, property ownership (joint or sole ownership of a house or land), age gap with her husband and an indicator for whether their fathers used to beat their mothers as indicators for the woman's background characteristics. Employment and spousal violence maybe endogenous, in that the incidence of spousal violence may affect women's labor market behavior (Bhattacharya 2015). We run our analysis with and without the

employment status of women in our vector of covariates to check if there are substantive changes in our results between the two specifications. Indicators for husband's background characteristics comprise his employment, education and a dummy for whether he drinks alcohol. Household characteristics include the respondents' wealth status, social group, type of place of residence (rural/urban), region of residence, and family size. While variables like respondents' attitude towards beating, husbands' control issues and exposure to print and television media can be important in explaining violence towards women, the direction of causality between these variables and our indicators of violence can work both ways. To avoid endogeneity concerns, we calculate the mean value of these variables at the PSU level and subsequently create a dummy to indicate when this average value takes a value greater than the median of its distribution. These variables constitute the environmental factors in our model. To examine intersectionality, we replace the social group and class categories (the latter reduced to a binary: poor/ non-poor) using intersectional dummies, which we describe in the next section.

Methods

Empirical Strategy

We estimate respondents' probability of reporting bodily (physical and sexual) violence with two separate probit regressions using the following specification:

$$V_i = \beta X_i + \mu_i \quad \forall \; i = 1,\ldots,n \qquad (1)$$

Since we use the same model to predict the probability of reporting physical and sexual violence, V_i in turn stands for the probability of reporting physical violence and sexual violence respectively and X_i is our vector of independent variables. The sign on the estimated coefficient β is the direction in which each regressor in our model affects the probability of reporting either kind of bodily violence.

Our main hypothesis posits that a woman who reports to have experienced bodily violence must also report feeling insulted. However, in attempting to empirically test this in a regression framework, we run into problems of endogeneity since the same variables which we use to explain the probability of reporting bodily violence are important in explaining the probability of respondents' report of feeling insulted as well, in addition to the report of bodily violence itself. In order to circumvent this potential problem, we instrument for respondents' report of physical and sexual violence by their PSU level aggregates in a manner similar to the one we used for constructing the indicators for environmental factors influencing report of bodily violence. To calculate these PSU level statistics, we use the proportion of respondents who have reported physical or sexual violence at the PSU level and subsequently create a dummy to indicate when this proportion takes a value greater than the median of its distribution. We then use an instrumental variable probit model to estimate the following equation

$$E_i = \alpha Z_i + \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad \forall\ i = 1,\ldots,n \qquad (2)$$

Where E_i is the probability of reporting insult, Z_i is a two-dimensional vector containing the binaries for physical and sexual violence aggregated at the PSU level serving as instruments for respondents' report of physical and sexual violence, and X_i is the same vector of controls as in the previous regression.

Capturing Intersectionality

In an alternative specification, we follow the method developed by Sen, Iyer, and Mukherjee (2009) to study intersectional differences in the reporting of violence. This method requires the creation of a set of dummy variables and testing the differences in the coefficients to capture within-group differences. Regressions can then be run on these dummies and other relevant control variables and the differences between the dummies can be tested statistically. The matrix of dummies thus created is described in Table 1.The uniqueness of this approach lies in the fact that such

differences can be tested without running numerous regressions with limited comparability. We repeat regressions (1) and (2) by replacing the separate wealth and social categories with the dummies listed in Table 1, treating non-poor Hindu Upper Caste (NPHUC) women as the reference group.

Additional Robustness Checks

We test the robustness of our results with ordered probit specifications using the frequency of each type of bodily violence reported rather than the binary of occurrence of spousal violence during the respondent's lifetime.

Sensitivity Analysis

We test the effect of intersectional positionalities of women on their likelihood of reporting insult by running probit regressions (and also ordered probit regressions) separately for two sub-samples of women, those who reported facing bodily violence and those who did not.

4. Results & Discussion

Sample Characteristics

Table 2 shows how the respondents in our sample are distributed across our independent variables. Around 23 percent of the respondents who were selected for the domestic violence module of NFHS-4 had missing responses to the questions of domestic violence. The distribution of the missing sample is similar to that of the non-missing sample across regions, wealth and social groups, but is heavily concentrated in the younger age groups (64 percent in 15-19 and 27 percent in 20-24) and women with a secondary education (65 percent). Only 8 percent of the respondents overall and most notably, only 23 percent of the women who report having faced either physical or sexual violence felt insulted or were made to feel bad about themselves.

Factors Affecting Bodily (Physical and Sexual) Violence and the Feeling of Insult

Table 3 and Table 4 show results from the probit regressions of bodily violence and instrumental variable probit regression of the feeling of insult on our vector of regressors.

Marital Capital

Our results contradict the findings of previous studies (Agarwal and Panda 2007) which show that the likelihood of violence decreases with increase in the duration of marriage. We find that while the likelihood of physical violence is higher for longer duration of marriage, duration of marriage is not significantly associated with the likelihood of women reporting sexual violence or having felt insulted.

Panda and Agarwal (2005) argue that having more children may have a dubious effect on the likelihood of violence. While having more children may offer the women support and protect her from violence, it would also mean greater demands of childcare and constriction of space, thus leading to greater stress and spousal violence. Tauchen, Witte, and Long (1991) show that while increase in the total number of children increases the likelihood of reporting violence, the number of younger children reduces it. However, we find that while women with more children are more likely to face bodily violence, they are less likely to report having felt insulted. Those who have children born in the last five years are also more likely to face bodily violence and less likely to report insult. These are the women who have greater stakes in the marriage or whose fallback options may be particularly weak (Agarwal 1997), so that they are more likely accept bodily violence without feeling insulted.

We find that women in consanguineous marriages are subject to higher risks of facing bodily violence and feeling insulted. Weimer (2019) finds the same and explains that this contrasts with the situation in other countries because of the practice of

dowry in India. In consanguineous marriages, the groom's family is better informed about the economic condition of the bride's natal family and violence is resorted to for extorting payments from them.

Woman's Background Characteristics

(Bhattacharyya, Bedi, and Chhachhi 2011) point out that a woman's education may affect her likelihood of facing violence in different ways. It may reduce violence through its income-augmenting effects, thus strengthening the woman's exit options. Again, higher education meaning higher awareness of the woman may challenge the male ego and trigger violence. We do not find support of the latter hypothesis and find that a woman's educational attainment reduces the likelihood of facing bodily violence and feeling insulted.

The link between a woman's employment status and her risks of facing violence has been much discussed in the literature. In line with most previous studies, we find that employed women are more likely to face bodily violence and feel insulted (Vyas and Watts 2008). However there are studies which qualify that only regular employment of women reduces the likelihood of violence (Panda and Agarwal 2005; Agarwal and Panda 2007). Moreover, Bhattacharyya, Bedi, and Chhachhi (2011) discuss that the woman's employment status and domestic violence are possibly endogenous and use caste, number of male and female children, and type of family as instruments. Bhattacharya (2015) hypothesizes a reverse causality between spousal physical and sexual violence and the likelihood of employment. Aware of the issues of potential endogeneity, we drop the variable of woman's employment in an alternative specification and find that our major findings remain unaltered (results not reported).

Panda and Agarwal (2005) and Agarwal and Panda (2007) highlight the importance of property ownership by women as deterrents of domestic violence since immovable property like

land and house boost the woman's self-esteem and strengthen her threat point. However, Bhattacharyya, Bedi, and Chhachhi (2011) highlight the possibility of control-fuelled violence when the wife is a property-owner. Our results also indicate the existence of multiple channels through which property ownership affects the likelihood of facing violence. We find that though the risk of facing bodily violence is lower for a woman who owns land alone or jointly, there is no significant difference in her likelihood of feeling insulted, as compared to a woman who does not own land. However, while a woman owning a house is less likely to report sexual violence and insult, house ownership does not affect the probability of her reporting physical violence.

We find that compared to younger women, older women are less likely to report having faced bodily violence but more likely to have felt insulted. It may be because younger women have lower threat points and limited fallback options in the society. We also see if the age gap between the spouses has a significant effect on the likelihood of violence. Panda and Agarwal (2005) and Agarwal and Panda (2007) find that greater age gaps between the husband and the wife are associated with lower likelihoods of violence. They hypothesize that this is because a man may have lower expectations from a much younger wife and find less faults with her. They also discuss the alternative possibilities; an older man may be more impatient and violent with his wife. Our findings interestingly show that the probability of facing physical violence decreases while that of facing sexual violence and insult increases when the age gap between respondents and their husbands increases.

Studies have shown that women who witnessed their mothers being beaten by their fathers are more likely to accept spousal violence as the norm (Hilberman and Munson 1977; Agarwal and Panda 2007; Panda and Agarwal 2005). Our results confirm this finding, with such women reporting greater risks of bodily violence and lesser chances of feeling insulted.

Husband's Background Characteristics

Husband's education reduces the probability of facing violence and feeling insulted. The risk of sexual violence and the likelihood of feeling insulted decreases for respondents whose husbands are employed. These findings probably reflect the fact that marital stress is lesser in families that are better off (Panda and Agarwal 2005). However, we find that the risk of physical violence is higher for those respondents whose husbands are employed in clerical, sales, agricultural or manual occupations as against those who are unemployed. In line with the findings of Rao (1997) and Palmer et al. (2016), we find that if the respondent's husband drinks alcohol then her likelihood of facing bodily violence and feeling insulted increases.

Household Characteristics

Agarwal and Panda (2007) hypothesize that violence would be less likely in economically better-off households. Lower economic status implies greater sharing of consumption goods and space. Moreover, richer households in India employ domestic help for carework and housework. This implies a lower scope of spousal conflict around the performance of household chores. We too find that women on the lower end of the socio-economic spectrum are at a higher risk of reporting physical and sexual violence and to have felt insulted. Women from poorer households are more likely to report having faced both kinds of bodily violence and also to have felt insulted, as are women belonging to the SCs. Interestingly however, once other correlates are controlled for, women from Hindu ST households are less likely to report physical violence, while their probability of reporting sexual violence or having felt insulted does not significantly differ from Hindu upper caste women. Traditional tribal societies have been characterized by exemplary co-operation between genders in work and in community, though scholars have observed a deterioration of such values over time (Agarwal 1997). The exit options might be stronger for these women because they have lesser stakes to be lost if the marriage breaks. Hindu OBC

women do not differ significantly in their likelihood of reporting bodily violence or insult. Muslim women are more likely to report sexual violence than women who are from the Hindu upper caste while the likelihoods of reporting physical violence and insult are not significantly different between the two groups. Women belonging to other religious groups are more likely to report sexual violence but less likely to report physical violence and insult than Hindu upper caste women.

Scholars have argued that caste, kinship and gender roles vary widely between the northern and the southern states of India. While the North Indian kinship system is based on village exogamy and lower empowerment of women, women have much greater autonomy in the South Indian kinship system (Chakraborty and Kim 2010; Dyson and Moore 1983).However, feminist scholars from South India have argued that the multiple disadvantages that women face are sometimes veiled under better human development outcomes, particularly with reference to the state of Kerala (Devika and Kodoth 2001). Somewhat confirming this hypothesis, we find that respondents from the southern region of India are more likely to report having faced physical violence and to have felt insulted than all other regions of the country except the eastern region and the western region respectively. Respondents from the central regions are more likely while those from the west are less likely to report sexual violence than respondents from the south. The probability of reporting sexual violence by respondents from the north, east or the north-east does not differ significantly from the probability of reporting sexual violence by respondents from the south.

The likelihood of reporting physical or sexual violence is lower if the respondent lives in an urban area. However, women from urban areas are more likely to report having felt insulted. This may hint at the relatively weaker exit options for rural women. While women living in larger families are less likely to have faced physical violence, family size is not significantly associated with

their likelihood of having experienced sexual violence or having felt insulted.

Environmental Factors

While respondents are more likely to report bodily violence if a majority of respondents in their community feel that wife beating is justified or have husbands with controlling behavior, they are also less likely to have felt insulted. This hints at the fact that social norms are instrumental in shaping women's fallback options and women accept the social order or 'doxa' around gender (Agarwal 1997). The probability of reporting physical violence increases with PSU exposure to the media (both print media and exclusive exposure to television). However, the likelihood of reporting sexual violence or insult is higher if most respondents in the PSU have exposure to print media but is lower if they are exposed to television only. The evidence on the role of exposure to television in shaping gender attitudes in India is mixed. While our findings seem to support the result of studies which argue that the content of television programs reinforces gender stereotypes (Mcmillin 2002), there are contesting studies on the positive role of television in mitigating gender disparities in India (Jensen and Oster 2009).

The Effect of bodily violence on the feeling of insult

We hypothesize that normatively bodily violence must be associated with the feeling of insult. Studies have shown that facing bodily violence lowers the victim's self-confidence (Hilberman and Munson 1977; Agarwal and Panda 2007; DeRiviere 2008). Women who experience physical violence are more likely to have worse mental health outcomes (Kumar et al. 2005). However, the respondent may not feel insulted even when facing bodily violence due to the normalization and acceptance of spousal violence in the society. Indeed in the NFHS sample, we find less than one out of four women who faced bodily violence reported having felt insulted. However, in the multivariate specification, the probability of reporting insult

varies positively with the incidence of physical and sexual violence (Table 4).

Intersectionality

The results of the models with interactions (column 2 and 4 of Table 3) show that all social groups among the poor are more likely to report both types of bodily violence than non-poor women from Hindu upper caste households. This probably indicates that the latter being socially and economically privileged, offer less scope for stress and violence. Among the non-poor, Hindu ST women and women from Muslim and other religions are less likely to report physical violence than women from the Hindu upper caste while Hindu SC women are more likely to do so. Again, Non-poor Hindu upper caste women are less likely to report sexual violence than SC, Muslim, and women from other religions, who are also non-poor. Non-poor ST women and non-poor women from the Hindu upper caste do not significantly differ in their likelihood of reporting sexual violence. However, this result does not hold when we drop woman's employment in an alternative specification (results not reported).

Nevertheless even after controlling for the experience of bodily violence, we find that non-poor Hindu upper caste women are less likely to report feeling insulted than women from all social categories, except women belonging Hindu OBCs and those from other religions (column 2 of Table 4). This indicates that these are the women who have greater stakes in the marriage and accept dominance and violence from their husbands as their lot. In Section 2, we have extensively discussed the literature suggesting that symbolic violence is omnipresent in better-off upper caste households (Chakravarti 1993; Chakravarti 2003/2018). This contradicts the general understanding in sociological literature that the lower castes, particularly those with aspirations of upward social mobility, often emulate the codes of Brahmanical Patriarchy in modern India (Chakravarty 2003/2018).

Studies which do not look into simultaneous interactions of caste, class and gender often miss out these nuances and conclude that women who are at the lower end of each axis have worse outcomes. Intersectional literature on the other hand enables us to examine how the social spectrum accommodates combinations of advantages and disadvantages. Advantages leveraged from a certain axis may be offset by the disadvantages stemming from other axes which crisscross with each other and shape norms, attitudes and outcomes (Mukhopadhyay 2015). Using the intersectional framework, we thus locate the privileged upper caste households as the major site of symbolic violence in India, quantitatively validating the insight of historical and sociological literature on this in the Indian context (Chakravarti 1993; Chakravarti 2003/2018)

Robustness Checks

For the two variables for which we have conducted probit regressions, we also run ordered probit regression using the frequency of reported bodily violence (Table A1). In all regressions, the base category of the dependent variable is no report of bodily violence, which is compared against the two higher categories pertaining to reports of infrequent and frequent violence. The estimates from this regression show that our main results are robust to the specification of ordered probit models which take into account the frequency of bodily violence. Some of the variables (such as the region of residence spousal age gap and husband's occupation) lose significance in the new specification.

Sensitivity Analysis

We run probit regressions of insult using two specifications, the general model and the intersectional model, separately for the two groups of women— those who have experienced bodily violence and those who have not (Table A2). We find that among both groups of women, those from non-poor upper castes are not more likely to report having felt insulted, as compared to any

of the other intersectional categories. Among those who have not reported facing bodily violence, poor Hindu SC women, poor and non-poor Muslim women, and poor women from other religions are more likely to report having felt insulted. Even among women who have experienced bodily violence, the likelihood of feeling insulted is not significantly higher among non-poor upper castes, as compared to any of the other intersectional categories. Poor and non-poor Muslim women and non-poor Hindu SC women are significantly more likely to report insult once they have reported facing bodily violence. We also run ordered probit regressions of insult on the two sub-samples, accounting for the frequency of insult and find that our results remain unaltered (results not reported).

5. Conclusion

Feminist scholars highlight that complicity of the victim often calls for a layered understanding of domestic violence in traditional societies (Sen 1995; Nussbaum 2005). Analyzing data from the latest round of the Indian NFHS, we find that more than one-fourth of the women in India who have experienced spousal bodily violence say that they never felt insulted by the action of their husbands. We hypothesize that this absence of the feeling of insult despite facing bodily violence indicates the presence of symbolic violence, which manifests through symbolic channels and is invisible even to the victim (Bourdieu 2001). Referring to the historical and sociological analysis of the domination of women by men in India, we invoke the framework of intersectionality to locate such violence. Chakravarti (1993;2003/2018) discusses how the social order in the caste-based Hindu society in India is self-sustained through the intersections of caste, class and sex. Brahmanical Patriarchy thrives by feeding on the systematic domination of the upper caste female, with such women themselves considering wifehood the ultimate end of their existence. Indeed, in this paper we find that though the likelihood of women facing any kind of violence is significantly lower in non-poor upper caste households, among women who

have faced bodily violence, women from non-poor upper caste households are less likely to have felt insulted. We thus conclude that these households are the major sites of symbolic violence in India.

However, we would end with the caveat that feeling insulted may not have direct repercussions on the threat point of women. Breaking a marriage is seen as a taboo across the social spectrum in India, since principles of togetherness are valorized and looked upon as the key to social organization (Kabeer 1999). Bhattacharyya, Bedi, and Chhachhi (2011) found a lower caste woman, who was a wage laborer in rural North India, saying that though she disliked being beaten by her husband, she would still stay in the marriage, since "only chinnals (characterless women) leave their husbands".

Agarwal (1997) explains that it may be misleading to interpret the absence of overt protest by women as their adaptive preference or lack of agency, since such an absence does not rule out the possibility of covert subversion by women. Ethnographic research has brought out women's covert responses to gender inequalities in different cultural contexts. In the Indian context, Suneetha and Nagaraj (2010) state that an approach focused on victimhood of women would undermine their 'strategic battles' within the institution of family. Indeed, 13 percent of women who reported having felt insulted did not report having faced any bodily violence. Conceptually this is the mirror image of the event of not feeling insulted even when facing bodily violence, and may reflect women's recognition of violence even in the absence of any visible injuries. This bears the promise of emerging as an interesting area of research.

References

Agarwal, Bina. 1997. "Bargaining"' and Gender Relations: Within and Beyond the Household." *Feminist Economics* 3 (1): 1–51.

Agarwal, Bina, and Pradeep Panda. 2007. “Toward Freedom from Domestic Violence: The Neglected Obvious.” *Journal of Human Development* 8 (3): 359–88.

Ahmad, Jaleel, Nizamuddin Khan, and Arupendra Mozumdar. 2019. “Spousal Violence Against Women in India: A Social–Ecological Analysis Using Data From the National Family Health Survey 2015 to 2016.” *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi:10.1177/0886260519881530

Becker, Gary S. 1965. “A Theory of the Allocation of Time.” *The Economic Journal* 75 (299): 493–517.

Bhattacharya, Haimanti. 2015. “Spousal Violence and Women’s Employment in India.” *Feminist Economics*, 21(2) 30-52.

Bhattacharyya, Manasi, Arjun S Bedi, and Amrita Chhachhi. 2011. “Marital Violence and Women’s Employment and Property Status: Evidence from North Indian Villages.” *World Development* 39 (9): 1676–89.

Bourdieu Richard, Pierre A4 - Nice. 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Chakraborty, Achin, and Simantini Mukhopadhayay. 2017. “Decomposing Nutritional Inequality by Caste and Class: A Quantitative Approach to Reckon Intersectionality.” *Economics Bulletin* 37 (2): 1339–50.

Chakraborty, Tanika, and Sukkoo Kim. 2010. “Kinship Institutions and Sex Ratios in India.” *Demography* 47 (4): 989–1012.

Chakravarti, Uma. n.d. *Gendering Caste Through a Feminist Lens*. SAGE-Stree.

———. 1993. “Conceptualising Brahmanical Patriarchy in Early India .” *Economic and Political Weekly* 28(14):579-585.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989(1):139-167.

———. 1991. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241-1299.

DeRiviere, Linda. 2008. “Do Economists Need to Rethink Their Approaches to Modeling Intimate Partner Violence?” *Journal of Economic Issues* 42 (3): 583–606.

Devika, J. 2001. “Sexual Violence and Predicament of Feminist Politics in Kerala.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 36(33):18-24.

Dinnerstein, Dorothy. 1976. *The Mermaid and the Minotaur*. New York: Harper and Row.

Dyson, Tim, and Mick Moore. 1983. “On Kinship Structure, Female Autonomy, and Demographic Behavior in India.” *Population and Development Review* 9 (1): 35–60.

Farmer, Amy, and Jill Tiefenthaler. 1997. “An Economic Analysis of Domestic Violence.” *Review of Social Economy* 55 (3): 337–58.

Folbre, Nancy. 1986. “Hearts and Spades: Paradigms of Household Economics.” *World Development* 14 (2): 245–55.

Hilberman, Elaine, and Kit Munson. 1977. “Sixty Battered Women.” *Victimology* 2 (3–4): 460–70.

IIPS (International Institute for Population Sciences) and ICF. 2017. “National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), 2015-16: India.” Mumbai.

Iyer, A., G. Sen, and P. Östlin. 2008. “The Intersections of Gender and Class in Health Status and Health Care.” *Global Public Health* 3 (sup1): 13–24.

Jensen, Robert, and Emily Oster. 2009. “The Power of TV: Cable Television and Women’s Status in India.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 124 (3): 1057–94.

Jungari, Suresh, and Sneha Chinchore. 2020. “Perception, Prevalence, and Determinants of Intimate Partner

Violence During Pregnancy in Urban Slums of Pune, Maharashtra, India." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*,. doi: 10.1177/0886260520914548.

Kabeer, Naila. 1999. "Resources, Agency, Achievements: Reflections on the Measurement of Women's Empowerment." *Development and Change* 30 (3): 435–64.

Karlekar, Malavika. 1998. "Domestic Violence." *Economic and Political Weekly* 33 (27): 1741–51.

Katz, Elizabeth. 1997. "The Intra-Household Economics of Voice and Exit." *Feminist Economics* 3 (3): 25–46.

Krais, Beate. 1993. "Gender and Symbolic Violence: Female Oppression in the Light of Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Social Practice." In *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Craig J Calhoun; Edward LiPuma; Moishe Postone. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kumar, Shuba, Lakshmanan Jeyaseelan, Saradha Suresh, and Ramesh Chandra Ahuja. 2005. "Domestic Violence and Its Mental Health Correlates in Indian Women." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 187 (1): 62–67.

Lerner, Gerda. 1986. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lodhia, Sharmila. 2009. "Legal Frankensteins and Monstrous Women: Judicial Narratives of the 'Family in Crisis." *Meridians* 9 (2): 102–29.

Maner;Marilyn, Murray Brown. 1980. Marriage and Household Decision-Making : A Bargaining Analysis. *International Economic Review* , 21 (1): 31-44.

McElroy, Marjorie B, Mary Jean Horney. 1981. "Nash-Bargained Household Decisions: Toward a Generalization of the Theory of Demand." *International Economic Review* 22 (2): 333–49.

Mcmillin, Divya C. 2002. "Ideologies of Gender on Television in India." *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 9 (1): 1–26.

Mosse, David. 2018. “Caste and Development: Contemporary Perspectives on a Structure of Discrimination and Advantage.” *World Development* 110: 422–36.

Mukhopadhyay, Amrita. 2017. “Suicide or Domestic Violence?” *Economic and Political Weekly* 52 (47): 81–84.

Mukhopadhyay, Simantini, Achin Chakraborty. 2018. “Caste-Gender Intersectionalities and the Curious Case of Child Nutrition: A Methodological Exposition.” In *Caste and Gender in Contemporary India Power, Privilege and Politics*, edited by Nandini Ghosh, Supurna Banerjee. London: Routledge.

Mukhopadhyay, Simantini. 2015. “The Intersection of Gender, Caste and Class Inequalities in Child Nutrition in Rural India.” *Asian Population Studies* 11 (1): 17–31.

Nedelsky, Jennifer. 1990. “Law, Boundaries, and the Bounded Self.” *Representations*, no. 30: 162–89.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2005. “Women’s Bodies: Violence, Security, Capabilities.” *Journal of Human Development* 6 (2): 167–83.

Palmer, Michael D., Jayadeep Patra, Mehak Bhatia, Sujata Mishra, and Prabhat Jha. 2016. “Risk of Intimate Partner Violence and Alcohol Use.” *Economic and Political Weekly* 51 (14): 86–87.

Panda, Pradeep, and Bina Agarwal. 2005. “Marital Violence, Human Development and Women’s Property Status in India.” *World Development* 33 (5): 823–50.

Patra P, Prakash J, Patra B, Khanna P. 2018. “Intimate Partner Violence: Wounds Are Deeper.” *Indian Journal of Psychiatry* 60: 494–98.

Rao, Vijayendra. 1997. “Wife-Beating in Rural South India: A Qualitative and Econometric Analysis.” *Social Science and Medicine* 44 (8): 1169–80.

Sekhon, Joti. 2000. *Modern India*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Sen, Amartya. 1995. “Gender Inequality and Theories of Justice.” In *Women, Culture, and Development: A Study of Human Capabilities*, edited by Martha C. Nussbaum and Jonathan Glover. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sen, Gita, Aditi Iyer, and Chandan Mukherjee. 2009. “A Methodology to Analyse the Intersections of Social Inequalities in Health.” *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities* 10 (3): 397–415.

Suneetha, A, and Vasudha Nagaraj. 2010. “Dealing with Domestic Violence towards Complicating the Rights Discourse.” *Indian Journal of Gender Studies* 17 (3): 451–78.

Tauchen, Helen V., Ann Dryden Witte, and Sharon K. Long. 1991. “Domestic Violence: A Nonrandom Affair.” *International Economic Review* 32 (2): 491.

Tenkorang, Eric Y., Adobea Y. Owusu, Eric H. Yeboah, and Richard Bannerman. 2013. “Factors Influencing Domestic and Marital Violence against Women in Ghana.” *Journal of Family Violence* 28 (8): 771–81.

Thomas, Duncan, John Strauss, Maria-helena Henriques, “How Does Mother ’ s Education Affect Child Height ?” *The Journal of Human Resources*, 26 (2): 183–211.

UN Women. 2020. Global Database on Violence against Women. 2020. https://evaw-global-database.unwomen.org/en.

Weber, Lynn, and Deborah Parra-Medina. 2003. “Intersectionality and Women’s Health: Charting a Path to Eliminating Health Disparities”. *Advances in Gender Research* 7:181-230.

Weimer, Louis. 2019. “Consanguinity and Intimate Partner Violence”. Published Thesis, UC San Diego. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4dr7g3j5.

Table 1: Intersectional Dummy Matrix

Social Group / Wealth Index	Hindu SC (HSC)	Hindu ST (HST)	Hindu Upper Caste (HUC)	Muslim (Muslim)	Other Religion (Other)
Poor (P)	Poor Hindu SC (PHSC)	Poor Hindu ST (PHSC)	Poor Hindu Upper Caste (PHUC)	Poor Muslim (PMuslim)	Poor Other (POther)
Non-poor (NP)	Non-poor Hindu SC (NPHSC)	Non-poor Hindu ST (NPHST)	Non-poor Hindu Upper Caste (NPHUC)	Non-poor Muslim (NPMuslim)	Non-poor Other (NPOther)

Table 2: Sample Characteristics

Characteristics	Non-Missing N=66,013	Missing N=17,384	Total N=83,397
Marital Capital			
Duration of marriage[a]	15.1(9.4)	3.5(4.3)	15(9.4)
0-5	19.8	1.1	15.6
6-10	17	0.2	13.2
11-25	45.2	0.1	35
Above 25	16.5	0.0	12.8
Missing	1.4	98.6	23.3
Number of children[a]	2.4 (1.6)	0.0(0.1)	1.8(1.7)
None	9.9	99.8	30.3
One	18.5	0.1	14.3
Two	32.6	0.1	25.3
3-5	34.2	0.0	26.5
6 or more	4.8	0.0	3.7
Presence of own children under 5	43.5	16.7	37.5
Consanguineous marriage	14.9	0.2	11.6
Women's background characteristics			
Education			
No education	32.4	5.4	26.3
Primary	14.3	5.7	12.3
Secondary	42.9	64.7	47.8
Higher	10.4	24.1	13.5
Currently working	25.1	19.2	23.8
Owns land	30.2	20	28
Owns house	40.5	25.3	36.8
Age[a]	33.2 (8.6)	19.1(4.3)	29.9(9.8)
15-19	3.5	64.4	17.3

(Continued)

Characteristics	Non-Missing N=66,013	Missing N=17,384	Total N=83,397
20-24	14.9	26.8	17.6
25-29	19.4	5.9	16.3
30-34	17.5	1.5	13.9
35-39	16.6	0.6	13
40-44	14.4	0.4	11.2
45-50	13.7	0.3	10.7
Spousal age difference[a,b]	5.1(4.2)	5.1(12)	5.1(4.3)
Father beat her mother	21.1	21.3	21.2
Men's background characteristics			
Age[a]	38 (9.7)	24.8 (13.1)	37.9 (9.7)
15-19	0.5	0.4	0.4
20-24	5.7	0.8	4.6
25-29	16.3	0.03	12.6
30-34	16.4	0.02	12.7
35-39	16.4	0.02	12.7
40-44	14.5	0.02	11.2
45-50	13.6	0.05	10.5
Above 50	13.4	0.04	10.4
Missing	5.6	98.6	26.6
Education			
No education	19.3	0.2	15
Primary	14.9	0.2	11.6
Secondary	51.5	0.8	40
Higher	14.2	0.2	11.1
Missing	0.00	98.6	22.3
Occupation			
Not working	4.2	0.4	3.4

(Continued)

Characteristics	Non-Missing N=66,013	Missing N=17,384	Total N=83,397
Professional/Technical/Managerial	8.1	0.02	6.3
Clerical	3	0.0	2.3
Sales	11.6	0.1	9
Agricultural	32.8	0.5	25.5
Services	10.3	0.1	8
Skilled/unskilled manual	29.9	0.4	23.2
Missing	0.0	98.6	22.3
Drinks alcohol	28.8	0.0	22.3
Environmental Factors[c]			
Justifies wife beating (PSU)	52.9(29.6)	49.8 (29.7)	52.8 (29.6)
Husband has control issues (PSU)	58.7(26.2)	65.3(23)	60.2(25.6)
Reads newspaper (PSU)	38.3(27.2)	43.1(27.7)	39.4(27.3)
Watches TV (PSU)	37(24.8)	34(23.7)	36.3(24.6)
Household Characteristics			
Social Group			
SC	17.6	17.8	17.6
ST	7.8	6.7	7.5
OBC	38.9	35.7	38.1
Hindu Other	17.2	17.4	17.2
Muslim	13.7	16.6	14.3
Other Religions	4.9	5.9	5.2
Region			
North	12.8	15.2	13.4
Central	21.1	25.4	22.1
East	22.7	19.5	22

(Continued)

Characteristics	Non-Missing N=66,013	Missing N=17,384	Total N=83,397
North-east	3	3.3	3
West	16	15.4	15.8
South	24.5	21.3	23.8
Urban	34.9	38.7	35.8
Family Size[a]	5.5(2.6)	5.7(2.3)	5.6 (2.5)
Intersectional Categories			
PHSC	8.6	7.7	8.4
PHST	5.3	4.1	5.1
PHOBC	13.3	11.9	13
PHOther	3.1	2.8	3
PMuslim	4.7	5.1	4.8
POther	1	1.1	1.1
NPHSC	8.9	10	9.2
NPHST	2.5	2.5	2.5
NPHOBC	25.5	23.8	25.1
NPHOther	14.1	14.6	14.2
NPMuslim	8.9	11.5	9.5
NPOther	3.9	4.8	4.1
Types of Violence			
Physical violence	29.8	-	-
Sexual violence	7	-	-
Emotional violence	13.9	-	-
Insult	8.1	-	-
Insult conditional on bodily violence	22.8	-	-
Bodily violence conditional on insult	87.2	-	-

(Continued)

Notes. [a] denotes a quantitative variable whose survey weight adjusted mean is reported along with its frequency distribution across categories where applicable.

[b] Spousal age difference is calculated by subtracting respondent's age from the age of her husband.

[c] Environmental factors report survey weight adjusted PSU aggregated means of each variable. Standard deviations are reported in parentheses. All other variables are qualitative, whose survey weight-adjusted percentages are reported.

Table 3: Probit regression results of Bodily Violence

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Sexual Violence	Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Martial Capital				
Duration of Marriage	0.010*** (18.68)	0.010*** (17.94)	0.000 (0.32)	-0.001 (-0.01)
Number of children	0.052*** (31.38)	0.056*** (33.82)	0.023*** (9.66)	0.025*** (10.72)
Presence of children 5 and younger	0.084*** (18.36)	0.086*** (18.77)	0.048*** (7.12)	0.051*** (7.48)
Consanguineous marriage	0.094*** (17.13)	0.091*** (16.66)	0.165*** (21.50)	0.161*** (20.98)
Women's Background Characteristics				
Education				
Primary	0.04*** (6.58)	0.03*** (4.9)	0.044*** (4.98)	0.038*** (4.3)
Secondary	-0.123*** (-21.35)	-0.142*** (-24.86)	-0.031*** (-3.68)	-0.041*** (-4.9)
Higher	-0.325*** (-31.64)	-0.371*** (-36.54)	-0.21*** (-12.43)	-0.231*** (-13.97)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Sexual Violence	Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Currently Working	0.12*** (25)	0.12*** (26.16)	0.094*** (14.12)	0.096 (14.48)
Owns land alone or jointly	-0.042*** (-6.69)	-0.039*** (-6.28)	-0.028** (-3.16)	-0.028** (-3.21)
Owns house alone or jointly	0.006 (0.97)	0.003 (0.64)	-0.033*** (-3.88)	-0.032*** (-3.82)
Current age	-0.007*** (-11.93)	-0.008*** (-13.52)	-0.002** (-2.67)	-0.003** (-3.14)
Spousal age difference	-0.004*** (-8.37)	-0.004*** (-8.91)	0.002** (2.84)	0.002* (2.45)
Father beat her mother	0.062*** (49.36)	0.062*** (49.59)	0.037*** (24.19)	0.038*** (24.35)
Men's Background Characteristics				
Employment				
Professional/ technical/ managerial	-0.065*** (-5.28)	-0.081*** (-6.59)	-0.063*** (-3.52)	-0.066*** (-3.68)
Clerical	0.039** (2.63)	0.028 (1.96)	0.000 (0.01)	-0.003 (-0.17)
Sales	0.027* (2.50)	0.018 (1.66)	-0.13*** (-8.2)	-0.133*** (-8.43)
Agricultural	0.048*** (4.84)	0.048*** (4.86)	-0.048*** (-3.47)	-0.048*** (-3.46)
Services	-0.06*** (-5.94)	-0.07*** (-6.31)	-0.069*** (-4.4)	-0.07*** (-4.46)
Skilled/Unskilled Manual	0.020* (2.02)	0.019 (1.87)	-0.148*** (-10.65)	-0.149*** (-10.69)
Education				
Primary	-0.012 (-1.85)	-0.015 (-2.25)	0.015 (1.65)	0.012 (1.40)
Secondary	-0.053*** (-9.13)	-0.063*** (-10.76)	-0.024** (-2.90)	-0.031*** (-3.77)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Sexual Violence	Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersec-tional*	*General*	*Intersec-tional*
Higher	-0.122*** (-13.37)	-0.148*** (-16.38)	-0.188*** (-13.30)	-0.204*** (-14.58)
Husband/partner drinks alcohol	0.678*** (158.77)	0.680*** (159.29)	0.562*** (93.65)	0.565*** (94.14)
Household Characteristics				
Wealth Index				
Poorer	-0.059*** (-9.46)		-0.009 (-1.01)	
Middle	-0.096*** (-14.55)		-0.121*** (-12.71)	
Richer	-0.177*** (-25.04)		-0.127*** (-12.12)	
Richest	-0.253*** (-31.04)		-0.099*** (-8.11)	
Social group				
HSC	0.077*** (11.19)		0.095*** (9.12.)	
HST	-0.098*** (-11.08)		0.015 (1.17)	
HOBC	0.0124* (2.06)		0.007 (0.71)	
Muslim	0.0148* (1.97)		0.114*** (10.04)	
Other	-0.04*** (-3.85)		0.108*** (6.96)	
Region				
North	-0.171*** (-22.11)	-0.182*** (-23.55)	-0.011 (-0.96)	-0.008 (-0.68)
Central	-0.0185** (-2.8)	-0.007 (-1.12)	0.047*** (4.83)	0.055*** (5.72)
East	-0.004 (-0.61)	0.014* (2.24)	0.19*** (20.1)	0.202*** (21.61)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Sexual Violence	Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersec-tional*	*General*	*Intersec-tional*
North-East	-0.238*** (-18.55)	-0.230*** (-17.85)	-0.010 (-0.51)	-0.008 (-0.45)
West	-0.085*** (-12.24)	-0.081*** (-11.56)	-0.127*** (-10.98)	-0.125*** (-10.82)
Urban	-0.073*** (-14.17)	0.017*** (3.49)	-0.068*** (-8.79)	-0.020** (-2.68)
Family size	-0.010*** (-12.33)	-0.012*** (-14.67)	0.001 (0.47)	-0.000 (-0.31)
Environmental Factors				
Justifies wife beating (PSU)	0.228*** (53.86)	0.231*** (54.59)	0.221*** (34.11)	0.223*** (34.38)
Control issues (PSU)	0.312*** (76.69)	0.314*** (77.34)	0.386*** (61.66)	0.385*** (61.70)
Reads newspaper (PSU)	0.011* (2.37)	0.003 (0.66)	0.018** (2.74)	0.012 (1.89)
Watches TV (PSU)	0.039*** (9.45)	0.035*** (8.62)	-0.075*** (-12.34)	-0.082*** (-13.43)
Intersectional Dummies				
PHSC		0.245*** (26.69)		0.17*** (12.68)
PHST		0.067* (6.27)		0.067*** (4.4)
PHOBC		0.161*** (19.15)		0.043*** (3.43)
PHUC		0.272*** (22.35)		0.005 (0.25)
PMuslim		0.215*** (19.38)		0.188*** (12.01)
POther		0.112*** (5.83)		0.185*** (7.32)
NPHSC		0.136*** (15.91)		0.058*** (4.39)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Sexual Violence	Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
NPHST		-0.001 (-0.07)		0.043* (2.01)
NPHOBC		0.07*** (10.13)		0.009 (0.79)
NPMuslim		0.0319*** (3.56)		0.079*** (5.71)
NPOther		0.002 (0.18)		0.085*** (4.66)
Constant	-0.899*** (-44.39)	-1.082*** (-52.30)	-2.004*** (-66.80)	-2.075*** (-67.79)
Observations	66013	66013	66013	66013

Notes:t statistics in parentheses. $^{*}p<0.05$, $^{**}p<0.01$, $^{***}p<0.001$.

Omitted groups: *Education/Husband's education*: No education. *Husband's Occupation:* No occupation. *Region:* South. *Wealth:* Poorest. *Social Group:* Hindu Upper Caste. *Intersectional Dummies:* Non-poor Hindu Upper Caste. Estimates are weighted by survey weights for domestic violence.

Table 4: IV Probit regression results of Insult

	(1)	(2)
	Insult	Insult
	General	*Intersectional*
Physical Violence	1.217*** (52.50)	1.215*** (52.37)
Sexual Violence	0.942*** (13.75)	0.960*** (14.06)
Marital Capital		
Duration of Marriage	-0.001 (-0.75)	-0.001 (-0.69)
Number of children	-0.017*** (-6.55)	-0.018*** (-7.27)
Presence of children 5 and younger	-0.05*** (-6.95)	-0.048*** (-6.76)
Consanguineous marriage	0.071*** (8.62)	0.071*** (8.59)
Women's Background Characteristics		
Education		
Primary	-0.121*** (-12.31)	-0.116*** (-11.89)
Secondary	-0.013 (-1.44)	-0.006 (-0.65)
Higher	-0.159*** (-9.35)	-0.155*** (-9.25)
Currently Working	0.064*** (9.22)	0.063*** (9.09)
Owns land alone or jointly	0.001 (0.05)	0.004 (0.40)
Owns house alone or jointly	-0.066*** (-7.16)	-0.067*** (-7.23)
Current age	0.005*** (5.55)	0.005*** (6.15)
Spousal age difference	0.002** (2.59)	0.002** (2.97)
Father beat her mother	-0.007*** (-3.34)	-0.007*** (-3.46)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)
	Insult	Insult
	General	*Intersectional*
Men's Background Characteristics		
Employment		
Professional/ technical/ managerial	0.031 (1.65)	0.031 (1.65)
Clerical	-0.084*** (-3.75)	-0.083*** (-3.68)
Sales	-0.065*** (-3.90)	-0.061*** (-3.65)
Agricultural	-0.087*** (-5.85)	-0.089*** (-5.99)
Services	-0.164*** (-9.54)	-0.165*** (-9.61)
Skilled/Unskilled Manual	-0.017 (-1.17)	-0.018 (-1.22)
Education		
Primary	-0.059*** (-6.01)	-0.056*** (-5.65)
Secondary	-0.029*** (-3.28)	-0.023** (-2.62)
Higher	-0.110*** (-7.45)	-0.102*** (-6.96)
Husband/partner drinks alcohol	0.232*** (24.01)	0.232*** (23.88)
Household Characteristics		
Wealth Index		
Poorer	-0.041*** (-4.30)	
Middle	-0.031** (-3.07)	
Richer	-0.022* (-2.03)	
Richest	-0.07*** (-5.39)	
Social group		
HSC	0.028*** (5.14)	

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)
	Insult	Insult
	General	*Intersectional*
HST	-0.001 (-0.09)	
HOBC	-0.012 (-1.80)	
Muslim	0.152*** (12.86)	
Other	-0.170*** (-9.86)	
Region		
North	-0.136*** (-10.71)	-0.141*** (-11.21)
Central	-0.212*** (-20.32)	-0.219*** (-20.87)
East	-0.217*** (-20.55)	-0.238*** (-22.52)
North-East	-0.061** (-2.97)	-0.096*** (-4.64)
West	0.041*** (3.85)	0.034*** (3.19)
Urban	0.046*** (5.7)	0.078*** (9.96)
Family size	-0.001 (-1.11)	-0.001 (-0.74)
Environmental Factors		
Justifies wife beating (PSU)	-0.045*** (-6.29)	-0.044*** (-6.13)
Control issues (PSU)	0.236*** (32.09)	0.234*** (31.83)
Reads newspaper (PSU)	0.0026 (0.35)	0.006 (0.84)
Watches TV (PSU)	-0.051*** (-7.92)	-0.043*** (-6.62)
Intersectional Dummies		
PHSC		0.083*** (5.64)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)
	Insult	Insult
	General	*Intersectional*
PHST		0.035** (2.04)
PHOBC		0.115*** (8.51)
PHUC		0.169*** (9.02)
PMuslim		0.323*** (18.44)
POther		-0.158*** (-5.17)
NPHSC		0.101*** (7.48)
NPHST		0.180*** (8.74)
NPHOBC		-0.014 (-1.23)
NPMuslim		0.128*** (8.94)
NPOther		-0.112*** (-5.61)
Constant	-2.199*** (-67.28)	-2.321*** (-69.42)
Observations	66013	66013

Notes:t statistics in parentheses. $^{*}p<0.05$, $^{**}p<0.01$, $^{***}p<0.001$.

Omitted groups: *Education/Husband's education*: No education. *Husband's Occupation:* No occupation. *Region:* South. *Wealth:* Poorest. *Social Group:* Hindu Upper Caste. *Intersectional Dummies:* Non-poor Hindu Upper Caste.

Estimates are weighted by survey weights for domestic violence.

Appendix

Table A1: Robustness Checks; Bodily Violence

	(1)	(3)	(2)	(4)
	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Martial Capital				
Duration of Marriage	0.009*** (16.56)	0.008*** (15.82)	0.000 (0.00)	-0.00 (-0.28)
Number of children	0.046*** (30.04)	0.05*** (32.72)	0.02*** (8.48)	0.022*** (9.43)
Presence of children 5 and younger	0.072*** (16.47)	0.074*** (16.97)	0.046*** (6.92)	0.048*** (7.25)
Consanguineous marriage	0.0878*** (16.98)	0.0855*** (16.52)	0.164*** (21.77)	0.160*** (21.26)
Women's Background Characteristics				
Education				
Primary	0.037*** (6.43)	0.027*** (4.65)	0.045*** (5.20)	0.039*** (4.55)
Secondary	-0.106*** (-19.28)	-0.125*** (-22.84)	-0.029*** (-3.42)	-0.037*** (-4.48)
Higher	-0.323*** (-31.80)	-0.368*** (-36.65)	-0.204*** (-12.21)	-0.224*** (-13.62)
Currently Working	0.103*** (23.87)	0.108*** (25.07)	0.09*** (13.71)	0.0921*** (14.07)
Owns land alone or jointly	-0.012* (-2.07)	-0.01 (-1.63)	-0.035*** (-3.93)	-0.036*** (-3.97)
Owns house alone or jointly	0.003 (0.63)	0.002 (0.31)	-0.006 (-0.75)	-0.006 (-0.68)
Current age	-0.006*** (-10.94)	-0.007*** (-12.64)	-0.002* (-2.55)	-0.003** (-2.96)
Spousal age difference	-0.004*** (-9.27)	-0.005*** (-9.73)	0.00132 (1.75)	0.001 (1.37)

(Continued)

	(1)	(3)	(2)	(4)
	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Father beat her mother	0.055*** (48.84)	0.056*** (49.12)	0.035*** (23.52)	0.035*** (23.67)
Men's Background Characteristics				
Employment				
Professional/ technical/ managerial	-0.052*** (-4.24)	-0.067*** (-5.54)	-0.056** (-3.19)	-0.0579** (-3.28)
Clerical	0.031* (2.16)	0.022 (1.54)	0.003 (0.15)	0.000 (0.02)
Sales	0.006 (0.53)	-0.00410 (-0.39)	-0.128*** (-8.22)	-0.131*** (-8.45)
Agricultural	0.034*** (3.54)	0.0346*** (3.60)	-0.051*** (-3.75)	-0.051*** (-3.74)
Services	-0.069*** (-6.37)	-0.073*** (-6.71)	-0.072*** (-4.71)	-0.073*** (-4.71)
Skilled/Unskilled Manual	-0.008 (-0.85)	-0.009 (-0.96)	-0.147*** (-10.74)	-0.147*** (-10.78)
Education				
Primary	-0.007 (-1.15)	-0.011 (-1.75)	0.013 (1.46)	0.011 (1.25)
Secondary	-0.049*** (-9.02)	-0.059*** (-10.90)	-0.026** (-3.22)	-0.032*** (-4.00)
Higher	-0.135*** (-15.31)	-0.161*** (-18.42)	-0.185*** (-13.15)	-0.199*** (-14.33)
Husband/partner drinks alcohol	0.626*** (154.13)	0.629*** (154.67)	0.556*** (93.57)	0.558*** (94.00)
Household Characteristics				
Wealth Index				
Poorer	-0.065*** (-11.05)		-0.001 (-0.13)	
Middle	-0.101*** (-16.29)		-0.113*** (-12.03)	

(Continued)

	(1)	(3)	(2)	(4)
	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Richer	-0.179*** (-26.44)		-0.132*** (-12.96)	
Richest	-0.258*** (-32.73)		-0.0970*** (-8.11)	
Social group				
HSC	0.071*** (10.61)		0.088*** (8.54)	
HST	-0.087*** (-10.12)		0.003 (0.21)	
HOBC	0.012* (2.04)		-0.002 (-0.23)	
Muslim	0.027*** (3.62)		0.104*** (9.26)	
Other	-0.028** (-2.78)		0.106*** (6.92)	
Region				
North	-0.160*** (-21.24)	-0.172*** (-22.83)	-0.011 (-0.97)	-0.008 (-0.68)
Central	-0.037*** (-5.94)	-0.026*** (-4.20)	0.040*** (4.18)	0.048*** (4.96)
East	-0.028*** (-4.51)	-0.009 (-1.42)	0.166*** (17.89)	0.176*** (19.17)
North-East	-0.256*** (-21.00)	-0.247*** (-20.18)	-0.032 (-1.67)	-0.030 (-1.60)
West	-0.054*** (-7.70)	-0.049*** (-7.01)	-0.135*** (-11.75)	-0.133*** (-11.60)
Urban	-0.07*** (-14.06)	0.021*** (4.38)	-0.06*** (-7.88)	-0.009 (-1.30)
Family size	-0.01*** (-12.03)	-0.012*** (-14.61)	0.001 (0.54)	-0.003 (-0.24)

(Continued)

	(1)	(3)	(2)	(4)
	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence
	General	*General*	*Intersec-tional*	*Intersec-tional*
Environmental Factors				
Justifies wife beating (PSU)	0.210*** (51.40)	0.213*** (52.14)	0.213*** (33.15)	0.214*** (33.41)
Control issues (PSU)	0.301*** (76.54)	0.303*** (77.20)	0.381*** (61.63)	0.381*** (61.62)
Reads newspaper (PSU)	0.017*** (3.85)	0.009* (2.10)	0.021** (3.13)	0.016* (2.42)
Watches TV (PSU)	0.031*** (7.86)	0.027*** (6.88)	-0.077*** (-12.85)	-0.082*** (-13.78)
Intersectional Dummies				
PHSC		0.235*** (26.98)		0.176*** (13.40)
PHST		0.089*** (8.64)		0.069*** (4.58)
PHOBC		0.171*** (21.00)		0.054*** (4.32)
PHUC		0.277*** (23.57)		0.04* (2.14)
PMuslim		0.220*** (20.82)		0.192*** (12.56)
POther		0.111*** (6.21)		0.186*** (7.54)
NPHSC		0.140*** (16.82)		0.061*** (4.70)
NPHST		-0.001 (-0.10)		0.040 (1.90)
NPHOBC		0.069*** (10.01)		0.004 (0.40)
NPMuslim		0.051*** (5.76)		0.079*** (5.75)

(Continued)

	(1)	(3)	(2)	(4)
	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Physical Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence	Frequency of Sexual Violence
	General	*General*	*Intersec-tional*	*Intersec-tional*
NPOther		0.0224 (1.90)		0.0970*** (5.27)
cut1	0.838*** (42.62)	1.026*** (51.24)	1.972*** (66.61)	2.056*** (67.81)
cut2	2.392*** (118.43)	2.579*** (125.55)	2.886*** (95.57)	2.970*** (96.21)
Observations	66013	66013	66013	66013

Notes: t statistics in parentheses. $^{*}p< 0.05$, $^{**}p< 0.01$, $^{***}p< 0.001$

Omitted groups: *Education/Husband's education*: No education. *Husband's Occupation:* No occupation. *Region:* South. *Wealth:* Poorest. *Social Group:* Hindu Upper Caste. *Intersectional Dummies:* Non-poor Hindu Upper Caste. Estimates are weighted by survey weights for domestic violence. Dependent variables take values 1, 2 and 3 for "Never", "Not Frequent" and "Frequent", respectively with "Never" serving as the base category.

Table A2: Sensitivity Analysis of Insult

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Insult (Violence = 0)	Insult (Violence=0)	Insult (Violence = 1)	Insult (Violence=1)
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Martial Capital				
Duration of Marriage	0.004 (0.82)	0.003 (0.79)	0.002 (0.68)	0.002 (0.64)
Number of children	-0.02 (-1.31)	-0.02 (-1.30)	-0.011 (-1.15)	-0.01 (-0.99)
Presence of children 5 and younger	0.04 (1.13)	0.04 (1.10)	-0.062* (-2.33)	-0.059* (-2.22)
Consanguineous marriage	0.117* (2.55)	0.118* (2.56)	0.049 (1.56)	0.047 (1.5)
Women's Background Characteristics				
Education				
Primary	-0.01 (-0.18)	-0.013 (-0.24)	-0.026 (-0.79)	-0.028 (-0.84)
Secondary	0.019 (0.37)	0.015 (0.30)	0.02 (0.59)	0.013 (0.43)
Higher	-0.129 (-1.56)	-0.157 (-1.94)	-0.016 (-0.23)	-0.034 (-0.50)
Currently Working	0.06 (1.48)	0.059 (1.54)	0.081*** (3.32)	0.082*** (3.39)
Owns land alone or jointly	-0.066 (-1.23)	-0.068 (-1.26)	0.01 (0.27)	0.009 (0.25)
Owns house alone or jointly	0.035 (0.69)	0.033 (0.65)	-0.071* (-2.18)	-0.07* (-2.15)
Current age	0.007 (1.46)	0.006 (1.40)	-0.00 (-0.07)	-0.00 (-0.13)
Spousal age difference	0.001 (0.16)	0.00 (0.10)	0.005* (2.04)	0.005* (2.03)
Father beat her mother	0.015* (1.97)	0.016* (2.03)	-0.002 (-0.4)	-0.003 (-0.42)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Insult (Violence = 0)	Insult (Violence=0)	Insult (Violence = 1)	Insult (Violence=1)
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Men's Background Characteristics				
Employment				
Professional/ technical/ managerial	0.044 (0.47)	0.03 (0.32)	-0.018 (-0.24)	-0.021 (-0.28)
Clerical	-0.020 (-0.17)	-0.029 (-0.25)	0.005 (0.06)	0.006 (0.07)
Sales	-0.097 (-1.08)	-0.106 (-1.19)	-0.038 (-0.59)	-0.036 (-0.57)
Agricultural	-0.161* (-2.00)	-0.171* (-2.12)	-0.092 (-1.65)	-0.091 (-1.63)
Skilled/Unskilled Manual	-0.093 (-1.15)	-0.10 (-1.21)	-0.043 (-0.77)	-0.041 (-0.73)
Services	-0.124 (-1.38)	-0.127 (-1.41)	-0.144* (-2.23)	-0.143* (-2.22)
Education				
Primary	-0.043 (-0.75)	-0.039 (-0.68)	-0.013 (-0.38)	-0.015 (-0.45)
Secondary	-0.049 (-0.96)	-0.044 (-0.87)	-0.042 (-1.36)	-0.048 (-1.55)
Higher	0.005 (0.06)	-0.002 (-0.03)	-0.134* (-2.31)	-0.140* (-2.44)
Husband/partner drinks alcohol	0.294*** (8.17)	0.293*** (8.15)	0.317*** (13.68)	0.319*** (13.76)
Household Characteristics				
Wealth Index				
Poorer	-0.030 (-0.55)		-0.072* (-2.27)	
Middle	-0.066 (-1.14)		-0.123*** (-3.47)	

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Insult (Violence = 0)	Insult (Violence=0)	Insult (Violence = 1)	Insult (Violence=1)
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Richer	-0.085 (-1.40)		-0.114** (-2.83)	
Richest	-0.192** (-2.75)		-0.124* (-2.56)	
Social group				
HSC	0.07 (1.11)		.065 (1.5)	
HST	0.034 (0.48)		-0.021 (-0.43)	
HOBC	0.006 (0.10)		-0.001 (-0.24)	
Muslim	0.235*** (3.80)		0.274*** (5.63)	
Other	0.085 (1.30)		-0.081 (-1.53)	
Region				
North	-0.066 (-1.14)	-0.072 (-1.24)	-0.143*** (-3.26)	-0.154*** (-3.51)
Central	-0.175** (-2.90)	-0.175** (-2.89)	-0.222*** (-5.74)	-0.219*** (-5.64)
East	-0.325*** (-4.69)	-0.324*** (-4.67)	-0.262*** (-6.43)	-0.259*** (-6.39)
West	0.035 (0.55)	0.031 (0.49)	0.07 (1.4)	0.07 (1.32)
North-East	-0.056 (-0.87)	-0.058 (-0.90)	-0.135** (-2.81)	-0.149** (-3.11)
Urban	-0.038 (-0.88)	0.036 (0.89)	0.01 (0.2)	0.064 (2.21) *
Family size	0.019* (2.31)	0.018* (2.25)	0.008 (1.37)	0.007 (1.2)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Insult (Violence = 0)	Insult (Violence=0)	Insult (Violence = 1)	Insult (Violence=1)
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
Environmental Factors				
Justifies wife beating (PSU)	0.168*** (4.86)	0.174*** (5.00)	-0.046 (-1.91)	-0.044 (-1.83)
Control issues (PSU)	0.257*** (7.47)	0.258*** (7.48)	0.224*** (9.44)	0.222*** (9.39)
Reads newspaper (PSU)	0.015 (0.37)	0.017 (0.42)	0.004 (0.15)	0.001 (0.06)
Watches TV (PSU)	-0.025 (-0.72)	-0.021 (-0.59)	-0.093*** (-3.98)	-0.095*** (-4.12)
Intersectional Dummies				
PHSC		0.230** (2.72)		0.083 (1.49)
PHST		0.163 (1.84)		0.041 (0.7)
PHOBC		0.127 (1.61)		0.082 (1.57)
PHUC		0.171 (1.53)		0.01 (0.13)
PMuslim		0.410*** (4.58)		0.387*** (5.92)
POther		0.308** (3.13)		-0.025 (-0.35)
NPHSC		0.074 (0.93)		0.114* (2.04)
NPHST		0.099 (0.93)		0.016 (0.19)
NPHOBC		0.0365 (0.58)		-0.063 (-1.29)
NPMuslim		0.235*** (3.29)		0.195** (3.14)

(Continued)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Insult (Violence = 0)	Insult (Violence=0)	Insult (Violence = 1)	Insult (Violence=1)
	General	*Intersectional*	*General*	*Intersectional*
NPOther		0.0658 (0.87)		-0.082 (-1.25)
Constant	-2.596*** (-14.65)	-2.745*** (-15.00)	-0.812*** (-6.90)	-0.911*** (-7.46)
Observations	43922	43922	17952	17952

Notes: t statistics in parentheses. $^{*}p< 0.05$, $^{**}p< 0.01$, $^{***}p< 0.001$

Omitted groups: *Education/Husband's education*: No education. *Husband's Occupation:* No occupation. *Region:* South. *Wealth:* Poorest. *Social Group:* Hindu Upper Caste. *Intersectional Dummies:* Non-poor Hindu Upper Caste. Estimates are unweighted.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

1. *Keynes, Kaldor and Development Economics* by Amiya Kumar Bagchi, July 2004.
2 *Epar Ganga Opar Ganga - A creative statement on displacement and violence* by Subhoranjan Dasgupta, July 2004.
3. *Samkhya and Vyanjanii: Understanding Underdevelopment* by Prasanta Ray, July 2004.
4. *Gender, History and the Recovery of Knowledge with Information and Communication Technologies: Reconfiguring the future of our past* by Bamita Bagchi, July 2004.
5. *Kerala's Changing Development Narratives* by Achin Chakraborty, October 2004.
6. *The Development Centrifuge: A Retrospect in Search of a Theory and a Centre* by Pinaki Chakraborti, February 2005.
7. *Capital Inflows into India in the Post-Liberalization Period: An Empirical Investigation by Indrani Chakraborty*,July 2005
8. *The Construction of the Hindu Identity in Medieval Western Bengal? The Role of Popular Cults* by Jawhar Sircar, July 2005
9. *Does Financial Development Cause Economic Growth? The Case of India* by Indrani Chakraborty, January 2007.
10. *China India Russia: Moving Out of Backwardness*, or, *Cunning Passages of History* by Amiya Kumar Bagchi, May 2007.
11. *Rethinking Knowledge as Ideology: Reflections on the Debate from Max Scheler to Theodor Adorno* by Sudeep Basu, September 2007.
12. *Financial Development and Economic Growth in India: An Analysis of the Post-Reform Period* by Indrani Chakraborty, January 2008.
13. *Migration, Islam and Identity Strategies in Kwazulu-Natal: Notes on the Making of Indians and Africans* by Preben Kaarsholm, April 2008.
14. *Socio Economic Profile of Patients in Kolkata: A Case Study of RG Kar and AMRI* by Zakir Husain, Saswata Ghosh and Bijoya Roy, July 2008.
15. *Education for Child Labour in West Bengal* by Uttam Bhattacharya, October 2008.

16. *What Determines the Success and Failure of '100 Days Work at the Panchayat Level? A Study of Birbhum District in West Bengal* by Subrata Mukherjee and Saswata Ghosh, February 2009.
17. *The Field Strikes Back: Decoding Narratives of Develop-ment* by Dipankar Sinha, March 2009.
18. *Female Work Participation and Gender Differential in Earning in West Bengal* by Indrani Chakraborty and Achin Chakraborty, April 2009.
19. *Rosa Luxemburg's Critique of Creativity and Culture* by Subhoranjan Dasgupta, May 2009.
20. *MDG-Based Poverty Reduction Strategy for West Bengal* by Achin Chakraborty, October 2009.
21. *The Dialectical Core in Rosa Luxemburg's Vision of Democracy* by Subhoranjan Dasgupta, January 2010.
22. *Contested Virtue: Imperial Women's Crisis with Colonized Womanhood* by Sukla Chatterjee, November 2010.
23. *Encountering Globalization in the Hill Areas of North East India* by Gorky Chakraborty, December 2010.
24. *Arundhati Roy: Environment and Literary Activism* by Debarati Bandyopadhyay, April 2011.
25. *Nineteenth Century Colonial Ideology and Socio-Legal Reforms: Continuity or Break?* by Subhasri Ghosh, June 2011.
26. *Long-Term Demographic Trends in North-East India and their Wider Significance 1901-2001* by Arup Maharatna and Anindita Sinha, 2011.
27. *Employment and Growth under Capitalism: Some Critical Issues with Special Reference* to India by Subhanil Chowdhury, July 2011.
28. *No Voice, No Choice: Riverine Changes and Human Vulnerability in The 'Chars' of Malda and Murshidabad* by Jenia Mukherjee, July 2011.
29. *Does Capital Structure Depend on Group Affiliation? An Analysis of Indian Corporate Firms* by Indrani Chakraborty, July 2011.
30. *Healing and Healers Inscribed: Epigraphic Bearing on Healing-Houses in Early India* by Ranabir Chakravarti and Krishnendu Ray July 2011.

31. *Pratyaha: Everyday Lifeworld* by Prasanta Ray, October 2011.
32. *Women, Medicine and Politics of Gender: Institution of Traditional Midwives in Twentieth Century Bengal* by Krishna Soman, November 2011.
33. *North East Vision 2020: A Reality Check* by Gorky Chakraborty, 2011.
34. *Disabled definitions, Impaired Policies: Reflections on Limits of Dominant Concepts of Disability*, by Nandini Ghosh, May 2012.
35. *Losing Biodiversity, Impoverishing Forest Villagers: Analysing Forest Policies in the Context of Flood Disaster in a National Park of Sub Himalayan Bengal, India* by Bidhan Kanti Das, July 2012.
36. *Women Empowerment as Multidimensional Capability Enhancement: An Application of Structural-Equation Modeling* by Joysankar Bhattacharya and Sarmila Banerjee, July 2012.
37. *Medical Education and Emergence of Women Medics in Colonial Bengal* by Sujata Mukherjee August 2012.
38. *Painted Spectacles: Evidence of the Mughal Paintings for the Correction of Vision* by Ranabir Chakravarti and Tutul Chakravarti, August 2012.
39. *Roots and Ramifications of a Colonial 'Construct': The Wastelands in Assam* by Gorky Chakraborty, September 2012.
40. *Constructing a "pure" body: The discourse of nutrition in colonial Bengal* by Utsa Roy, November 2012.
41. *Public-Private Partnerships in Kolkata: Concepts of Governance in the Changing Political Economy of a Region* by Sonali Chakravarti Banerjee, May 2013.
42. *Living Arrangement and Capability Deprivation of the Disabled in India* by Achin Chakraborty and Subrata Mukherjee, November 2013.
43. *Economic Development and Welfare: Some Measurement Issues* by Dipankar Coondoo, January 2014.
44. *Exploring Post-Sterilization Regret in an Underdeveloped Region of Rural West Bengal* by Saswata Ghosh, April 2014.
45. *Promoter Ownership and Performance in Publicly Listed Firms in India: Does Group Affiliation Matter?* by Ansgar Richter and Indrani Chakraborty, February 2015.

46. *Intersectionality and Spaces of Belonging: Understanding the Tea Plantation Workers in Dooars* by Supurna Banerjee, March 2015.

47. *Is Imperialism a Relevant Concept in Today's World?* by Subhanil Chowdhury, March 2015.

48. *Understanding Northeast India through a 'Spatial' Lens* by Gorky Chakraborty and Asok Kumar Ray, April 2015.

49. *Influence of Son Preference on Contraceptive Method Mix: Some Evidences from 'Two Bengals'* by Saswata Ghosh and Sharifa Begum, April 2015.

50. *Purchasing Managers' Indices and Quarterly GDP Change Forecast: An Exploratory Note Based on Indian Data* by Dipankor Coondoo and Sangeeta Das, January 2016.

51. *Role of Community and Context in Contraceptive Behaviour in Rural West Bengal, India: A Multilevel Multinomial Approach by* Saswata Ghosh and Md. Zakaria Siddiqui, February 2016.

52. *Employment Growth in West Bengal : An Assessment* by Subhanil Chowdhury and Soumyajit Chakraborty, March 2016.

53. *Effects of Ownership Structure on Capital Structure of Indian Listed Firms: Role of Business Groups vis-a-vis Stand-Alone Firms* by Indrani Chakraborty, March 2016.

54. *From 'Look East' to 'Act East' Policy: continuing with an Obfuscated Vision for Northeast India* by Gorky Chakraborty, March 2016.

55. *Rural Medical Practitioners: Who are they? What do they do? Should they be trained for improvement? Evidence from rural West Bengal* by Subrata Mukherjee & Rolf Heinmüller, February 2017.

56. *Uncovering Heterogeneity in the Relationship between Competition, Corporate Governance and Firm Performance using Quantile Regression on Indian Data* by Indrani Chakraborty, March 2017.

57. *The Railway Refugees: Sealdah, 1950s-1960s* by Anwesha Sengupta, March 2017.

58. *Underemployment in India: Measurement and Analysis* by Subrata Mukherjee, Dipankor Coondoo & Indrani Chakraborty, November 2017.

59 *Caste-Gender Intersectionalities and the Curious Case of Child Nutrition : A Methodological Exposition,* by Simantini Mukhopadhyay & Achin Chakraborty, February 2018.

60 *Changing socioeconomic inequalities in child nutrition in the Indian states: What the last two National Family Health Surveys say,* by Simantini Mukhopadhyay & Achin Chakraborty, July 2018

61 *Measuring households' multidimensional vulnerability due to health shocks: Evidence from National Sample Survey 71st round data* by Subrata Mukherjee & Priyanka Dasgupta, August 2018.

62. *In search of nationalist trends in Indian anthropology: opening a new discourse* by Abhijit Guha, September 2018

63. An approach toward methodological appraisal of social research by Achin Chakraborty, January 2019

64. *Can Ayushman Bharat National Health Protection Mission protect health of India's Poor?* by Subhanil Chowdhury & Subrata Mukherjee, January 2019

65. *Debt-Financing and Product Market Competition in an Emerging Economy: Evidence from India,* Indrani Chakraborty, March 2019

66. *Class Processes and Cooperatives*, Manas R Bhowmik & Achin Chakraborty, June 2019

67. *Human Connection in the Light of the Writings of Karl Marx and Amartya Sen* by Simantini Mukhopadhyay, February 2020

68. *Outpatient care and expenses: Can they be ignored in health insurance programmes* by Subrata Mukherjee & Anoshua Chaudhuri, February 2020

69. *Solidarities in and through Resistance: Rethinking Alliance-building through Protests in Plantations in India*, Supurna Banerjee, March 2020

70. *Bengali Migrant Workers in South India : An inquiry into their earnings and living*, Monalisha Chakraborty, Subrata Mukherjee & Priyanka Dasgupta, March 2020

71. *Distress financing for out-of-pocket hospitalization expenses in India: An analysis of Pooled National Sample Survey Data,* Priyanka Dasgupta & Subrata Mukherjee, March 2021

SPECIAL LECTURES

1. *Education for Profit, Education for Freedom* by Martha C. Nussbaum, March 2008.
2. *Always Towards : Development and Nationalism in Rabindranath Tagore* by Himani Bannerji, May 2008.
3. *The Winding Road Toward Equality for Women in the United States* by Diane P. Wood, June 2008.
4. *Compassion : Human and Animal* by Martha C. Nussbaum, July 2008.
5. *Three 'Returns' to Marx : Derrida, Badiou, Zizek (*Fourth Michael Sprinker Lecture) by Aijaz Ahmad, March 2012.
6. *Inequality: Reflections on a Silent Pandemic* by Ashwani Saith, December 2009.
7. *A Study in Development by Dispossession* by Amit Bhaduri, March 2015.

WORKING PAPERS

1. *Primary Education among Low Income Muslims in Kolkata: Slum Dwellers of Park Circus* by Zakir Husain, July 2004.
2. *Impact of District Primary Education Programme (DPEP) on Primary Education: A study of South 24 Parganas* by Suman Ray, July 2004.
3. *Representation of Public Health in the Print Media : A Survey and Analysis* by Swati Bhattacharjee, January 2009.
4. *Maternal Anthropometry and Birth Outcome Among Bengalis in Kolkata* by Samiran Bisai, April 2009.
5. *Transfer of Technology and Production of Steel in India*, An interview of Anil Chandra Banerjee by Amiya Kumar Bagchi, December 2013.

BOOKS

1 *Economy and the Quality of Life - Essays in Memory of Ashok Rudra*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Manabendu Chattopadhyay and Ratan Khasnabis (editors), Kolkata, Dasgupta & Co.,2003.

2 *The Developmental State in History and in the Twentieth Century,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Regency Publications, New Delhi, 2004.

3 *Pliable Pupils and Sufficient Self –Directors: Narratives of Female Education by Five British Women Writers*, 1778-1814 Barnita Bagchi, Tulika, New Delhi, 2004.

4 *Webs of History: Information, Communication and Technology from Early to Post-colonial India,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi, Dipankar Sinha and Barnita Bagchi (editors), New Delhi, Manohar, 2004.

5 *Maladies, Preventives and Curatives: Debates in public health in India*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and Krishna Soman (editors), Tulika, New Delhi, 2005.

6 *Perilous Passage: Mankind and the Global Ascendancy of Capital,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi**,** Rowman and Littlefield Lanham, Maryland, USA, 2005.

7 *Globalisation, Industrial Restructuring, and Labour Standards: Where India meets the Global*, Debdas Banerjee**,** Sage Publication, 2005.

8 Translation with an introduction of Rokeya S. Hossain: *Sultana's Dream and Padmarag,* Barnita Bagchi**,** Penguin Modern Classics, 2005.

9 *The Evolution of State Bank of India, Vol. I, The Roots 1806-1876*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi, The Penguin Portfolio edition, Penguin Books, 2006.

10 *Capture and Exclude: Developing Economies and the Poor in Global Finance*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and Gary Dymski (editors), Tulika, New Delhi, 2007.

11 *Labour, Globalization and the State: Workers, Women and Migrants Confront Neoliberalism*, Edited, Michael Goldfield and Debdas Banerjee (editors), Routledge, London and New York, 2008.

12 *Eastern India in the Late Nineteenth Century, Part I: 1860s-1870s*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and Arun Bandopadhyay (editors), Manohar and Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi, 2009.

13 *Indian Railway Acts and Rules 1849-1895: Railway Construction in India : Selected Documents (1832-1900),* Vol. IV, Bhubanes Misra (editor); Amiya Kumar Bagchi (General Editor), Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi, 2009.

14 *Colonialism and Indian Economy,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi**,** New Delhi, Oxford University Press, 2010.

15 *Market Media and Democracy*, compiled, Buroshiva Dasgupta**,** Institute of Development Studies Kolkata, 2011.

16 *Four Essays on Writing Economic History of Colonial India*, Institute of Development Studies Kolkata and Progressive Publishers, 2011.

17 *Rabindranath: Bakpati Biswamana***,** Volume 2, Sudhir Chakravarti (editor), Rabindranath Tagore Centre for Human Development Studies, 2011.

18 *Rabindranath: Bakpati Biswamana***,** Volume1**,** Sudhir Chakravarti**,** Rabindranath Tagore Centre for Human Development Studies, 2011.

19 *Eastern India in the Late Nineteenth Century, Part II: 1880s-1890s* , Amiya Kumar Bagchi & Arun Bandopadhyay (editors), Manohar and Indian Council of Historical Research, New Delhi 2011.

20 *Universally Loved: Reception of Tagore in North-east India***,** Indranath Choudhuri (editor), Rabindranath Tagore Centre for Human Development Studies and Progressive Publishers, 2012.

21 *The Politics of the (Im)Possible***,** Barnita Bagchi (editor), Sage, 2012.

22 *Transformation and Development: The Political Economy of Transition in India and China*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi and Anthony P.D'Costa (editor), Oxford University Press, 2012.

23 *Market, Regulations and Finance: Global Meltdown and the Indian Economy,* Indrani Chakraborty and Ratan Khasnabis (editors), Springer, March 2014.

24 *Indian Skilled Migration and Development: To Europe and Back*, Uttam Bhattacharya and Gabriela Tejada, *et al.*, (editors), New Delhi: Springer, 2014.

25 *The Look East Policy and Northeast India*, Gorky Chakraborty and Asok Kumar Ray (editors), Aakar Books, 2014.

26 *An Introduction to the History of America***,** Jenia Mukherjee and C. Palit (editors), New Delhi: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

27 *History and Beyond: Trends and Trajectories*, Jenia Mukherjee and C. Palit (editors), New Delhi: Kunal Books, 2014.

28 *Biodiversity Conservation in India: Management Practices, Livelihood Concerns and Future Options,* Bidhan Kanti Das, Ajit Banerjee (editors), Concept Publishing Co. Ltd.,2014.

29 *Marxism: With and Beyond Marx,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi and Amita Chatterjee (editors), Routledge, 2014.

30 *Democratic Governance and Politics of the Left in South Asia,* Subhoranjan Dasgupta (editor) Aakar Books, New Delhi, 2015.

31 *Southern India in the Late Nineteenth Century, Vol. 1, Part IA : 1860s-1870s,* Amiya Kumar Bagchi & Arun Bandopadhyay (editors) Manohar, New Delhi 2015.

32 *Southern India in the Late Nineteenth Century, Vol. 1, Part IB : 1860s-1870s*, Amiya Kumar Bagchi & Arun Bandopadhyay (editors) Manohar, New Delhi 2015.

33 *Pratyaha : Everyday Lifeworld : Dilemmas, Contestations and Negotiations,* Prasanta Ray and Nandini Ghosh (editors) Primus Books, 2016.

34 *Interrogating Disability in India: Theory and Practice in India,* Nandini Ghosh (editor), Springer India, 2016.

35. *Impaired Bodies, Gendered Lives: Everyday Realities of Disabled Women,* Nandini Ghosh, Primus Books, 2016.

36 *Rethinking Tribe in the Indian Context: Realities, Issues and Challenges***,** Bidhan Kanti Das and Rajat Kanti Das (editors), Rawat Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2017.

37 *The Land Question in India : State, Dispossession and Capitalist Transition*, Achin Chakraborty and Anthony P. D'Costa (editors), Oxford University Press(UK), 2017.

38 *Activism and Agency in India : Nurturing Resistance in the Tea Plantations*, Supurna Banerjee.

39. *Sustainable Urbanization in India: Challenges and Opportunities,* Jenia Mukherjee (editor), Springer, 2017.

40. *Water Conflicts in Northeast India*, Gorky Chakraborty, K.J. Joy, Partha Das, Chandan Mahanta, Suhas Paranjape, Shruti Vispute (editors), Routledge, 2017.

41. *Caste and Gender in Contemporary India : Power, Privilege and Politics,* eds. Supurna Banerjee and Nandini Ghosh, New Delhi and South Asxia Routledge, 2019.

42. *Limits of Bargaining: Capital, Labour and the State in Contemporary India,* Achin Chakraborty, Subhanil Chowdhury, Supurna Banerjee and Zaad Mahmood, Cambridge University Press, 2019.

43. *Changing Contexts and Shifting Roles of the Indian State: New Perspectives on Development Dynamics* eds. Achin Chakraborty and Anthony P. D'Costa, Springer, 2019.