



A Literature Review on Domestic Violence Expressed from Gender Perspective

Suzan Naji Sabri

Department of Sociology, College of Law and International Relations, French Lebanese University, Erbil, Kurdistan Region

Suzan.Sabri@lfu.edu.krd

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: 2/11/2022

Accepted: 8/12/2022

Published: Winter 2022

Keywords: *Domestic Violence, Gender Perspective, Intimate Partner Violence, Risk Factors.*

Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.7.1.32

ABSTRACT

This article provides a review of the literature on domestic violence from a gender perspective. Based on scientific evidence, the main topic of discussion is the gender-related risk factors for intimate partner violence. In order to reveal the role of gender in intimate partner violence, the work examined intimate partner violence through literature sources. Previous research has shown that women, in particular, are more likely than men to become victims of intimate partner violence. One risk factor for this is the reality of being financially dependent, which allows perpetrators to use violence against female partners. Aside from financial issues, other risk factors include pregnancy, a poor communication style between partners, and divorce.

Introduction

1.1 Background of the Article

In recent decades, domestic violence has been an intense area of study. Violence against women in the form of domestic violence occurs in all cultures and societies (Arango et al.,2014). Both the UN Women's Convention and the Council of Europe Convention No. 210 (2011) on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, better known as the Istanbul Convention obliged countries on decreasing violence against women and domestic violence whereby the Istanbul Convention explicitly mentions that this approach must be gender-sensitive. These treaties address violence against women as a form of discrimination against women



and as a violation of human rights. United Nations (UN) defines domestic violence as violence committed against women because they are women and the violence happened undue (Turkey's withdrawal from the Istanbul Convention).

In general, regarding domestic violence, Iraq has a gender-neutral policy as the government of Iraq have received a gender-responsive budgeting approach to close severe gender gaps. This gender-neutral policy is authorized by the General Directorate of Combating Violence Against Women in the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. This work is carried out with the intention to provide knowledge and awareness in terms of domestic violence. In addition to that, this literature review also focuses on the role of gender in intimate partner violence to develop professional expertise concerning a gender-sensitive approach to domestic violence (Arango et al., 2014). This paper is developed based on scientific literature to explore the relationship between gender and partner violence.

1.2 Problem Statement

Domestic violence is an issue in the Kurdish society, especially intimate partner violence. Unfortunately, not much research has been conducted in Iraqi Kurdistan concerning this topic. Therefore, this literature review will describe the risk factors of intimate partner violence including the psychosocial problems that are hardly associated with gender (Breiding, Black and Ryan, 2005). Gender plays an important role in domestic violence and the kind of relationships in which it is realized. This work emphasizes intimate partner violence. Partner violence can be a substantial part of domestic violence (Veen and Bogaerts, 2010).

1.3 The Aim of the Paper

This paper aims to elaborate exclusively on the gender-related risk factors for intimate partner violence based on scientific evidence. The paper mainly consists of international literature as this theme has been studied very less in the Kurdish society in comparison to the rest of the world. The included literature studies have been carried out in the Kurdistan Region, the Western and neighboring countries of Iraqi Kurdistan.

1.4 Questions

A set of research questions are formulated to draw out the domestic violence in relation to gender through various literature studies that have been carried out inside and outside of Iraqi-Kurdistan. Therefore, this paper is organized around ways to find answers to one main question: what is the relationship between domestic violence, gender roles, and intimate partner violence? As a result, the sub-questions that follow will address the underlying elements of the main question.

1. What are the factors that contribute to domestic violence?
2. What are different forms of domestic violence?

1.5 Social Relevance

Domestic violence is not only a private problem but also a social one. One of the social issues confronting Kurdistan after the 1991 uprisings was the issue of domestic violence, in particular aggressive behaviour against women. At the end of the 1990s, the issue turned into an increasing phenomenon. The Kurdish government along with international organizations tried to decrease and put an end to this issue. Everyone agreed that the task of the government is to prevent and solve domestic violence.

Domestic violence is still an unfinished agenda in the Kurdistan Region in which certain major amendments are required to broaden the legal aspects of the law. An interview with Kurdo Omar that was conducted by Sulaiman (2013) argues that it is proper that at coverage degree the Kurdistan Region Government (KRG) has evolved toward gender equality and has removed the primarily gender-based violence. However, Sulaiman (2013) describes that any act of gender-based violence is considered to be a major violation of women’s human rights worldwide. Victims of violence can be of any sex, but often “domestic violence in most cases is perpetrated by men against women” (Sulaiman, 2013 p.5). In light of the above facts, it appears that one of the main objectives of the Kurdistan Region’s law is to create strategies for the prevention, protection and exercise of gender-based violence in the Region. Nevertheless, the strategies aim to fully implement the progress of women and to create legal protection against the terror regime that meet in the family.

However, unfortunately, the law has proved to be ineffective and inefficient when it deals with the prevention of violence against women in the



Kurdish public sphere for several reasons. Despite that, the law identifies the major crimes of gender-based violence, it still lacks some legal aspects that should have been considered by the lawmakers (Sulaiman, 2013 p.7). Additionally, Sulaiman categorizes violence against women in Iraqi Kurdistan into three classifications; structural violence (economic), cultural violence (tradition and society), and direct violence (Sulaiman, 2013 p.2). Economically speaking, the full progress of women in the public and private spheres in the Kurdistan Region is missing. Women's financial independence is taken into consideration as a manner out of home violence and it is far extensively diagnosed as essential for allowing females to manage their lives.

On the other hand, Payton (2019) argues in his book entitled *The Honor and Political Economy of Marriage in Kurdistan Region of Iraq*, that Kurdish women in Iraq certainly have greater faith in the police's ability to address domestic violence than women in the South-Central region. The Kurdish polity have made commitments to reducing violence against women that often exceed those of their neighbor's (Payton, 2019 p. 7).

Besides, some perpetrators (often those of low social status) are sentenced commensurately with the offence of murder, regardless of their claims of an honorable motivation. This shows an increasing, if uneven, determination to tackle issues of violence against women within the KRI. Although, more studies need to be conducted in the Kurdistan Region by academics and politics concerning this subject.

1.6 Overview

After the introduction section, the present paper will continue elaborating on the meaning of gender. Next, the relationship between gender and violence will be discussed as well. Then, a brief description of the importance of gender-related determinants of violence will be shared. Also, this paper pays attention to the socio-economic status of migrant women and which dependencies among these women may play a role.

2. WHAT IS GENDER?

The term gender describes how women and men function in a social, cultural, economic and political context and focuses on inequalities and stereotypes that

appear due to the 'natural appearance' of male and female differences. However, gender is not about biological differences, but about the social interpretation of male and female roles. Holmes (2007) indicates that gender roles have evolved historically and are culturally determined in a specific socio-economic, political and cultural context. Plus, gender is influenced by factors such as age, class and ethnicity, as well as religion and sexual orientation. The term "sex" refers to the biological and physical characteristics of women and men. According to Holmes (2007, p.28), there is a continuum in both gender and sex with many variations (male, female, transgender and intersex) and also in terms of sexual orientation (lesbian/gay, bisexual, straight, asexual).

2.1 Gender Sensitivity

Gender sensitivity refers to the socio-cultural roles associated with the two sexes and in particular the resulting differences in power, equality, dependence and behavioral expectations. Working from a gender perspective means being aware of differences in the essence and the extent of violence that affects women and men (Holmes, 2007). Violence should be placed in the broad social context of inequality, especially between the sexes. In the absence of gender sensitivity, relevant causes related to that inequality are insufficiently recognized, acknowledged, addressed and eliminated. A gender-sensitive approach to violence considers gender-related causes and context, therefore an effective approach must pay attention to intimate partner violence. Bugeja (2008, p.15) indicates that organizations can tackle issues related to gender sensitivity such as what represent gender discrimination, what ways are needed to internalize the gender perspective into the organizations mechanism and so on.

3. PARTNER VIOLENCE PROFILES

As in the previous section is written about the background information of gender this section provide from gender perspectives, several profiles of intimate partner violence that are described in the literature (Johnson and Leone, 2005). A distinction is made between different profiles to provide insight into how power and control could play a role, but also what the background of the violence and the consequences



for the victim would be (Johnson and Leone, 2005). In addition to that, it also argues that the most common profiles are; common couple violence and intimate terrorism, and violent resistance.

3.1 Common Couple Violence and Intimate Terrorism

Common couple violence is the most common form of intimate partner violence. This means that intimate partner violence only occurs under certain circumstances or in certain situations and that both partners use violence. In this type of violence, there is not so much a question of one partner having power and exerts control over the other, but it arises when conflicts escalate. That is why the severity of the violence, therefore, differs per couple. The violence can occur incidentally. In some cases, the violence is chronic and then usually related to external factors that lead to stress, such as substance use or lack of communication skills (see also negative communication style). In common couple violence, both partners are both perpetrator and victim, but there can be a difference in the seriousness of the violence and the consequences: the seriousness and consequences of violence can be greater for women than for men.

Intimate terrorism can be seen as the most extreme form of partner violence in which the victim often needs support such as shelter (Johnson and Leone, 2005, p.347). Intimate terrorism refers to violence in which power and control are used by the perpetrator to dominate the partner severely for a long time. The perpetrator often uses physical and sexual violence but sometimes other forms of violence such as psychological abuse, manipulation, threat and humiliation can be present as well. Another form is related to be economic abuse in which the partner is deliberately kept financially dependent.

Apart from the forms above, there is an additional form that is worth mentioning in which the perpetrator may try to isolate the partner from her social network. In this case, violence is very serious and especially if there is a history of forcible violence, however, the threat alone can be enough to gain power and having control over the victim (Johnson and Leone, 2005, p.322) cited in (Johnson, 1995). Intimate terrorism usually involves male perpetrators and female victims. Often, this violence consists of stereotypical role patterns (Leone, Johnson and Cohan, 2007). An essential

element of this kind of domestic violence is that it is interwoven with an interaction pattern of having control and dominance of men over women. Therefore, women become more often victims of coercive control by their partners rather than reversed (Johnson and Leone, 2005).

3.2 Violence Resistance

In the case of violent resistance, the victim inflicts violence against a violent, controlling partner (Johnson, 2005, p.1127). Verwijs and Lunnemann (2012) argue that the victim uses violence to resist the perpetrator after a long period of being victim of violence (often intimate terrorism is involved). Yet, this type of violence becomes a type of self-defense, however Johnson argues in his article that he purposely do not use the term self-defense as he believe that in this context, it do not meet the legal definition of self-defense. In addition, violence resistance cannot always be seen as self-defense by the women who response back violently to their partner's intimate terrorism (Johnson, 2005 p. 1127).

4. CHARACTER AND SCOPE OF PARTNER VIOLENCE

4.1 Scope of Violence

Domestic violence from gender perspective exists of different types of violence that is paired with different form of violence. From gender perspective, there are many different sources to determine the extent of intimate partner violence, examples are registry data and representative population surveys. It is worth sharing that prevalence outcome of intimate partner violence may differ slightly depending on the chosen method.

In Kurdistan Region, data on violence against women is covered by the pretext of domestic violence (Human Rights Monitoring Project, 2013). An important contribution to the ongoing effort is not to combat gender-based violence with domestic violence as this is a necessary step towards a better understanding of the nature and scope of violence against women in northern Iraq.

A cross-sectional study was conducted by Al-Atrushi et al., (2013, p. 8) concerning intimate partner violence against women in the Erbil city of the Kurdistan region, argues that in Kurdistan Region of Iraq there is a high prevalence of intimate partner



violence, particularly emotional abuse. Yet, physical violence was also found as significant problem in terms of their consequences. However, it can be mentioned that in Kurdistan Region, the information on violence against women is an area in which data is not only limited but often unreliable. According to 'Documenting Violence Against Women in Iraqi Kurdistan', a project by Heartland Alliance in 2009 which carries the biggest data collection challenge, proves that the majority of cases of gender-based violence are never reported and a large number of the cases that are reported in the law of enforcement are withdrawn.

In many cases, victims are more likely to seek assistance from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) such as women's shelters. These cases may not be reported to the police, hospitals or other governmental institutions. If the data collected by the government agencies are not linked with that collected by women's organizations and other NGOs helping victims, this will lead to a significant gap in understanding the nature and scope of the problem (Heartland Alliance, 2009). The same document argues that violence against women and gender-based violence are technical terms used interchangeably to collectively refer to violent acts that are primarily or exclusively committed against women. This type of violence targets a specific group with the victim's gender as a primary motive (Heartland Alliance, 2009 p. 11).

However, other forms of violence have been added to existing forms. Women are helplessly exposed to sexual and domestic violence, sexual harassment, kidnapping and murder (Directorate to Trace Violence Against Women, 2009). Honor killings and burnings are considered by some as justified forms of punishment.

In Europe, abuse and threats against women more often take place in the private spheres and in most cases, it involves intimate partner violence (Van der Veen and Bogaerts, 2010). A European study by the Scientific Research and Documentation Center (WODC) indicates that women are significantly more often victims of (ex-)partner violence than men. Women are significantly more often victims of violence by their (ex-)partner than men (78% versus 59%), while men are more often victims of violence by other family members and friends (Heijden, Cruyff and van Gils, 2010).

4.2 Forms of Violence

Besides looking at the scope of the violence, it's important to highlight some different forms of violence for a better understanding of domestic violence from a gender perspective. Various studies show that males and females do not differ significantly when it comes to psychological abuse, such as threatening, humiliating, and belittling, and when it comes to physical abuse such as hitting, pushing, scratching, and spades (Straus, 2006; Archer, 2000).

Additionally, and comparing to men, women are more likely to be victims of severe physical violence. Another study by Felson (2007) reveals that men and women are equally likely to be verbally aggressive, but data shows that men more often use violence and can generate fear in their partners. This is confirmed by a study conducted in America by Caldwell, Swan and Woodbrown who argue that female victims more often experience fear during a conflict involving violence compared to male victims. Therefore, male perpetrators are more likely to use violence to control the victim. Female offenders often use physical violence as a reaction to the violence of the man (Caldwell, Swan and Woodbrown, 2012; van der Aa, 2014; Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000).

Another form of violence is sexual violence, which is more common among women (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). Women who are married or who live with men are more likely to be victims of rape in which the male partner is the perpetrator. Furthermore, women are more likely than men to be victims of sexually inappropriate behavior. According to the same study by Tjaden and Thoennes (2000), they claim that stalking is more common among women in comparison to men. However, according to a study conducted by van der Aa (2014), the percentage of stalking among men is underreported. He also mentioned that men do not easily see themselves as victims, so they report as victims of intimate partner violence less frequently. Furthermore, the same study contends that men experience less fear as a result of stalking than women.

Other categories might be included which could be further broken down. For example, women and girls are also subjected to economic violence, psychological abuse and verbal assaults. These will be more difficult to identify and collect through

government agencies and might be better assessed by a study designed to survey a sample of the population (Health Alliance, 2009 p. 12).

4.3 Consequences of Partner Violence

The majority of cases indicate that the consequences of intimate partner violence differ between women and men. Studies conducted in America and Canada argue that compared to male victims of violence, women have three times a higher possibility to get injured due to violence and in many cases, there is a need for medical attention. In some circumstances, women were admitted to the hospital because of the severity of their injuries. As an outcome of partner violence, the absence of women in their work domain, unfortunately, steers women to unemployment (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000; Ansara and Hindin, 2011).

Moreover, the same studies show that female victims of violence have experienced psychosocial consequences. For example, PTSD (Posttraumatic Stress Disorder) is more common in female victims of intimate partner violence (Ansara and Hindin, 2011). Nevertheless, in their research, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) describe that female victims of violence often have more fear for their love than men. The psychosocial consequences for male victims often manifest themselves in depressive symptoms (Pico-Alfonso et al., 2006). A qualitative study among 68 men proved that male victimization is related to shame, denial, stigma and fear. Additionally, male victims report violence less often to professionals than women. This is as well the case for male victims of sexual violence as the majority of male victims have a higher risk of depression and suicidal thoughts but at the same time, they do not seek help (Pico-Alfonso et al., 2006, pp. 603-604).

5.DETERMINATION OF VOLENCE

From a gender-sensitive approach considering domestic violence, it is important to look at the context of the case. In this way, one can gain insights into how certain factors play a role as some of these factors can increase the risk of violence. Usually, gender-related dependencies between partners, unequal relationships and role expectations play a role in maintaining the situation of violence or it causes a

hindrance to an effective solution. This section will elaborate on the most important gender-related factors and dependencies.

5.1 Gender-Related Risk Factors

In general, the risk factors for intimate partner violence are the same for men and women, but they manifest differently in these groups. This section will examine the risk factors that contribute to or sustain partner violence, as well as how these risk factors are related to gender. This section differentiates between social and intrapersonal factors:

Social Factors: financial dependence, joint children, and intergenerational transmission of domestic violence.

Inter-Intrapersonal Factors: negative communication style, divorce, and pregnancy.

5.2 Social and Cultural Factors

5.2.1 Financial dependence

If a partner is financially dependent on the perpetrator, it makes it more difficult to stop the relationship and the violence can continue. In Kurdistan Region, the majority of women are economically dependent on their husbands. This means that these women who are financially dependent on their partners, also belong to their partners. Even in families with high socioeconomic status, women are most often financially dependent on their husbands or fathers as they are the main breadwinner. Concerning women that work, often they work part-time and are usually not financially independent (Sulaiman, 2013). Financial dependence among women increases the risk of abuse (Bornstein, 2006).

Furthermore, being economically dependent makes it more difficult to leave your partner if there is not enough income for one's livelihood and housing. Thus, as Bornstein (2006) argues in his article that women without work experience are particularly at risk because if they decide to leave their partners, they have little chance to own an income, except for social assistance in some western countries. Yet, educational level plays also an important role in finding a job and having own income (Human Rights Monitoring Project, 2013 p.8). Access to education is an important tool to empower women and give them the ability to seek greater financial independence.



A study conducted by Anderson (2007), shows that economically independent women are more likely to end an abusive relationship, but women who suffer from depression are having less chance of ending their relationship. The same study argues that the opposite appears to be true for men, which is understandable from a gender perspective. Men who are victims of moderate or reciprocal violence are less likely to end the relationship if they are financially independent (Anderson, 2007 p.185). A possible explanation is that the norm is that a man is responsible for the income within the family and therefore cannot end the relationship.

5.2.2 Joint children

If a victim has children living in a house with the perpetrator, he or she is less likely to break off the relationship. In that case, the violent situation can continue. The partners are often unaware of what the consequences of domestic violence are on children. Due to stereotypes about the role of the mother (taking care of the family and keeping the family together), it can be more difficult for a woman to leave her partner.

Furthermore, when dealing with migrants, in some cases the partner get threats that the children will be taken to the country of origin, the fear of never seeing the children again in such a case is greater and this can also lead to decide to stay in an abusive relationship (Erez, and Britz, 2006). A distinct study shows that (older) children can also exert pressure on mainly the mother, so that she will not leave the perpetrator. Likewise, the same study indicates that children are more likely to blame the mother for the violence that takes place, by the way, mothers also often blame themselves (Moulding, Buchanan, and Wendt, 2015). Nonetheless, this is mainly the case if the children themselves are also victims of violence. The mother would then not be good at protecting her children from the perpetrator. Outsiders more often hold the mother responsible for the lack of protection for children in the event of violence. Mothers are more frequently stigmatized by the community if they do not want to leave the partner (Ebenstein, 2014).

In their article, Erez and Britz (2006), explain that in some migrant groups, having a daughter can lead to conflicts, because the preference is for a son. During pregnancy (psychological) violence can already occur against the woman, because she would be

guilty of the fact that she is pregnant with a daughter. A study by Ebenstein (2014) discusses that this is the case within migrant families from Asia and Islamic countries.

5.2.3 Intergenerational transmission of domestic violence

In addition to the earlier mentioned gender-related risk factors for violence, there appears to be a gender component in the intergenerational transmission of domestic violence. Studies by Swan and Snow (2006); and Whitfield, Anda, Dube, and Felitti (2003), about violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence describes that growing up in a conflicted family with aggression and violence, increases the risk of committing crimes.

Besides from that, they end up later in a life full of violence in their intimate relationships and against their children. The same study indicates that children who were abused or witnessed violence between their parents, later more often use violence against their children or partner, or become self a victim of violence. Gender differences also play a role here (Swan and Snow, 2006).

Another study by Stith and colleagues (2000, p.651) found out that men who grow up in a violent family are more likely to become perpetrators and women are more likely to be victims of intimate partner violence. The same study also indicates that there is a stronger relationship between experiencing violence in childhood and becoming a victim of intimate partner violence as an adult, than between witnessing violence and victimization (Stith et al, 2000).

Heyman and Slep (2002) discover similar gender differences. Concerning men, witnessing violence from father to mother will ensure to become a perpetrator as an adult, both against children and against their partner. While concerning women, the risk of victimization of intimate partner violence is mainly increased by violence from mother to child in childhood. When women witness violence from mother to father in their youth, it increases the risk of partner violence by the woman as an adult. The example of parents can therefore be an important role in the intergenerational transmission of violence (Heyman and Slep, 2000).

5.3 Inter-Intrapersonal Factors

5.3.1 Pregnancy

Pregnancy can also be seen as a risk factor for violence. Many studies indicate that during the pregnancy, domestic violence can start or even get worse (James, Brody, and Hamilton, 2013). Therefore, the woman is more likely to have multiple injuries. During pregnancy, the perpetrator often uses other forms of physical violence, such as beating in the abdomen or genitals. Violence during pregnancy can have major consequences for the health of the mother, but also for the unborn child and can even be fatal. Causes of violence in pregnancy include jealousy towards the unborn child and aversion to the unborn child. This is especially the case in an unwanted pregnancy (Johnson, 2007).

Although, sometimes the violence during pregnancy can decrease or temporarily stop because the partner does not want to harm the unborn child. Therefore, some women try to get pregnant in order to temporarily stop the violence end. Risk factors for violence during pregnancy include young age, substance use, low level of education (Saltzman and et al., 2003).

It is worth mentioning that the same study indicates that women with higher education than their partner have an increased risk of domestic violence during pregnancy. Unfortunately, pregnant women often do not dare to admit that they are victims of domestic violence. Plus, if they are at a consultation with a care provider, the partner often goes with them as in this way the violence discussion will be avoided.

5.3.2 Negative communication style

Another danger of domestic violence is when in relationships where there is a negative communication style (e.g. name-calling, ignoring the other, or responding aggressively), there is likely more chance to experience partner violence. A study by Feldman and Ridley (2000), highlights that a negative communication style can also influence the severity and frequency of violence. Besides, If abusive partners are less assertive, they are often less able to express themselves emotionally.

The same study also indicates that in relationships where the man uses violence, there are often situations where the partner wants to discuss a problem and then the man deliberately ends the discussion or shows avoidant behaviour. In relationships where the man uses violence, verbal aggression between partners is also more common. Mostly men with low problem-solving abilities are more likely to be verbally aggressive. A negative communication style also influences whether the violence continues. The response to violence can influence the occurrence of repeated violence: victims whom themselves react aggressively by verbal abuse or threats increase the risk of becoming a victim again.

A study by Lawick and Groen (2008) that was conducted in the Netherlands about violence in family relationship, discuss that a negative spiral of violence in which the romantic ideal of a relationship is disrupted by differences between partners. In addition to that, these scholars describe that when women express displeasure towards their partner, their partners get frustrated as they see this displeasure as criticism. In the end, frustration between partners will lead to anger and violence that sometimes takes very serious forms.

5.3.3 Divorce

A divorce can lead to partners using violence or to the fact that the violence escalates (Kelly and Johnson, 2008). Apart from that, in a relationship in which there is never violence during the divorce period violence can arise. In the literature, men speak of “separation instigated violence” (Kelly and Johnson, 2008 p. 481). Both men and women can be perpetrators of separation instigated violence. Usually, the perpetrator is the one who is abandoned and who is shocked by the choice of the partner to divorce and therefore reacts violently. In this way, the perpetrator can take possessions to destroy his or her partner or to throw objects.

Furthermore, in relationships where there is already 'common couple violence', the violence can continue or escalate after the divorce. Yet, this “intimate terrorism” can escalate violence after divorce and have even fatal consequences, especially if the offender gets the feeling of losing control over the partner as a result of the divorce (Kelly and Johnson, 2008).



5.4 Social and Economic Status

Tackling domestic violence, it is important to also pay attention to socio-economic factors status (SES). A low SES is often associated with all kinds of risk factors, such as substance use. Researches indicate that the more risk factors someone has, the higher the chance of domestic violence (Dube et al., 2003). Although intimate partner violence occurs in all SES groups, studies over the past 30 years have shown that especially a low SES is related to partner violence and that mainly the males are perpetrators.

Additionally, the education level and family income, in particular, are important factors. Low income increases the risk of violence against women in a relationship. Also, the lower the income, the more serious the violence (Dube, S. R., Felitti, V. J., Dong, M., Chapman, D. P., Giles, W. H., & Anda, R. F. (2003). Childhood abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction and the risk of illicit drug use: the adverse childhood experiences study (Capaldi et al., 2012). Also, this can be the case if a woman earns more or has a higher status than her husband.

The same study also indicates that financial stress in the family also appears to be related to violence. It turns out that both male and female perpetration is more common when the family is experiencing financial stress. Yet, partners with a low SES show jealousy and dominant behaviour more often. In general, unemployment appears to be a risk factor for intimate partner violence, although the studies do not provide a clear picture. If a woman has a job and the man is unemployed, the risk of violence also appears to increase. It is worth pointing out that when both partners are unemployed, the risk of violence is lower.

6. CONCLUSION

To answer the main question of this paper, it can be concluded that this work is an attempt to map the role of gender in intimate partner violence. According to this review, women are more vulnerable than men in partner violence and that this is related to their gender. Women appear to suffer more severe consequences as a result of partner violence than men. From a gender perspective, it is also important to pay attention to male victims of partner violence because they, too, can suffer from a variety of negative (health) consequences. It is critical for professionals working in

the field of intimate partner violence to identify risk factors for partner violence,, such as low income as well as the role of gender in these risk factors. Furthermore, certain dependencies, such as financial dependency, give the perpetrator the ability to use violence against his female partners. On the other hand, this study shows that women in particular are more likely to depend on their partners. Incidentally, men can also depend on their female partners if, for example, children are involved. Furthermore, other social factors that can make people vulnerable should be taken into account, such as pregnancy and divorce. Concerning the Kurdistan Region, further research is needed to be conducted by the government in cooperation with academics about domestic violence, violence against women along with their risk factors.

References

1. Al-Atrushi, H. H., Al-Tawil, N. G., Shabila, N. P., & Al-Hadithi, T. S. (2013). Intimate partner violence against women in the Erbil city of the Kurdistan region, Iraq. *BMC women's health, 13*(1), 1-9.
2. Allen, M. (2011). Is there gender symmetry in intimate partner violence?. *Child & Family Social Work, 16*(3), 245-254.
3. Anderson, K. L. (2007). Who gets out? Gender as structure and the dissolution of violent heterosexual relationships. *Gender & Society, 21*(2), 173-201.
4. Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2011). Psychosocial consequences of intimate partner violence for women and men in Canada. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 26*(8), 1628-1645.
5. Arango, D.J., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund, S. and Ellsberg, M., 2014. Interventions to prevent or reduce violence against women and girls: A systematic review of reviews.
6. Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological bulletin, 126*(5), 651.
7. Bornstein, R. F. (2006). The complex relationship between dependency and domestic violence: Converging psychological factors and social forces. *American psychologist, 61*(6), 595.
8. Breiding, M. J., Black, M. C., & Ryan, G. W. (2008). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence in eighteen US states/territories, 2005. *American journal of preventive medicine, 34*(2), 112-118.
9. Bugeja, S. (2008). A gender sensitivity manual.
10. Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., & Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of violence, 2*(1), 42.



11. Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse, 3* (2), 231–280.
12. Directorate to Trace Violence Against Women: *Women's Social condition in Kurdistan region: annual rapport*. Erbil: Kurdistan Regional Government; 2009
13. Dube, S. R., Felitti, V. J., Dong, M., Chapman, D. P., Giles, W. H., & Anda, R. F. (2003). Childhood abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction and the risk of illicit drug use: the adverse childhood experiences study. *Pediatrics, 111*(3), 564-572.
14. Ebenstein, A. (2013). Why do Parents Abort Girls? Patrilocality and Its Historical Origins.
15. Erez, E., & Britz, L. (2006). Providing a helping hand to battered immigrant women: The professionals' perspectives. *Migration, culture conflict, crime and terrorism*, 199-216.
16. Feldman, C. M., & Ridley, C. A. (2000). The role of conflict-based communication responses and outcomes in male domestic violence toward female partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17*(4-5), 552-573.
17. Felson, R. B., & Outlaw, M. C. (2007). The control motive and marital violence. *Violence and Victims, 22*(4), 387-407.
18. Heartland Alliance, 2009. *Documenting Violence Against Women in Iraqi Kurdistan*. Available at: <https://www.heartlandalliance.org/hai-test-site/wp-content/uploads/sites/29/2017/02/Documenting-Violence-Against-Women-in-Iraqi-Kurdistan.pdf>
19. Heyman, R. E., & Slep, A. M. S. (2002). Do child abuse and interparental violence lead to adulthood family violence?. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 64*(4), 864-870.
20. Holmes, M. (2007). *What is gender?: Sociological approaches*. Sage.
21. James, L., Brody, D., & Hamilton, Z. (2013). Risk factors for domestic violence during pregnancy: a meta-analytic review. *Violence and victims, 28*(3), 359-380.
22. Johnson, M. P. (2005). Domestic Violence: It's Not about Gender: Or Is It?. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1126-1130*.
23. Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of family issues, 26*(3), 322-349.
24. Kaya, Z. N. (2017). Gender and statehood in the Kurdistan region of Iraq.
25. Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family court review, 46*(3), 476-499.
26. Kim, J., & Gray, K. A. (2008). Leave or stay? Battered women's decision after intimate partner violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 23*(10), 1465-1482.
27. Lawick, V., & Groen, M. (2008). Intime war. Violence and vulnerability in family relationship. *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice, 20*(3), 59-76.



28. Leone, J. M., Johnson, M. P., & Cohan, C. L. (2007). Victim help seeking: Differences between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. *Family relations, 56*(5), 427-439.
29. Lünemann, K., & Pels, T. Kenniscahier.
30. Ministry of Interior, General Directorate of Combating Violence against Women.2019. *The statistics of GBV cases received by DCVAW over KRI 2019*. Received 20 September 2021, <https://www.bgtakrg.org/en/>
31. Moulding, N. T., Buchanan, F., & Wendt, S. (2015). Untangling Self-Blame and Mother-Blame in Women's and Children's Perspectives on Maternal Protectiveness in Domestic Violence: Implications for Practice. *Child Abuse Review, 24*(4), 249-260.
32. Payton, J., 2019. *Honor and the Political Economy of Marriage*. Rutgers University Press.
33. Pico-Alfonso, M. A., Garcia-Linares, M. I., Celda-Navarro, N., Blasco-Ros, C., Echeburúa, E., & Martinez, M. (2006). The impact of physical, psychological, and sexual intimate male partner violence on women's mental health: depressive symptoms, posttraumatic stress disorder, state anxiety, and suicide. *Journal of women's health, 15*(5), 599-611.
34. Saltzman, L. E., Johnson, C. H., Gilbert, B. C., & Goodwin, M. M. (2003). Physical abuse around the time of pregnancy: an examination of prevalence and risk factors in 16 states. *Maternal and child health journal, 7*(1), 31-43.
35. Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., Middleton, K. A., Busch, A. L., Lundeberg, K., & Carlton, R. P. (2000). The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 62*(3), 640-654.
36. Straus, M. A. (2006). Future research on gender symmetry in physical assaults on partners. *Violence against women, 12*(11), 1086-1097.
37. Sulaiman, G. N. (2013). *Domestic Violence Against Women in Kurdistan Region* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Duhok).
38. Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2006). The development of a theory of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence against women, 12*(11), 1026-1045.
39. Swanberg, J., Macke, C., & Logan, T. K. (2007). Working women making it work: Intimate partner violence, employment, and workplace support. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 22*(3), 292-311.
40. Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence against women, 6*(2), 142-161.
41. Van der Aa, S. (2012). Stalking as a form of (domestic) violence against women: two of a kind. *Rassegna italiana di criminologia, 3*, 174-187.

42. van der Heijden, P. G., Cruyff, M. J., & van Gils, G. H. (2010). Omvang van huiselijk geweld in Nederland.
43. Van der Veen, H. C. J., & Bogaerts, S. (2010). *Huiselijk geweld in Nederland*. Boom Juridische uitgevers.
44. Verwijs, L. M., & Lünemann, K. (2012). Partner violence: Background and risk factors. *Utrecht: Verwey-Jonker Instituut*.
45. Whitfield, C. L., Anda, R. F., Dube, S. R., & Felitti, V. J. (2003). Violent childhood experiences and the risk of intimate partner violence in adults: Assessment in a large health maintenance organization. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 18(2)*, 166-185.

پیداچوونہ وہیہک لہ سہر توندوتیژی خیزانی لہ روانگہی دہرختنی رہگہزہ وہ

پوختہ:

ئہم بابہ تہ پیداچوونہ وہیہک و تیروانینیکی گشتی لہ سہر توندوتیژی خیزانی لہ روانگہی جیندرہ وہ دہ خاتہ پوو. خالی سہرہکی پیداچوونہ وہ کہ فاکتہرہ مہ ترسیدارہ کانی ندوتیژی بہ رامبہر بہ نافرہت لہ نیو خیزاندا دہ گریتہ خوئی. لہم باسہدا لہرپی سہرچاوه زانستیہ کانہ وہ لیکوئینہ وہی لہ سہر توندوتیژی ہاوبہش کراوہ، بوئہ وہی رولی توندوتیژی لہ نیوان ہر دوو رہگہزدا پوونبکاتہ وہ، لہ ئہ نجامدا ئہ وہ خوئی بوو، کہ ژنان ئہ گہری زورتربان ہہیہ، بوئہ وہی بین بہ قوربانی توندوتیژی بہ بہراورد لہ گہل پیاودا، لہم بارہدا ناسہر بہ خوئی ئابووری ژن یہ کیکہ لہو ہویانہی، کہ دہرفہت دہدات بہ تاوانباران بوئہ وہی لہ نیو ژینی ہاوسہر گیریدا توندوتیژی بہ رامبہر بہ ژنان ئہ نجامبہدن. لہ پال باری ئابووری چہند ہوی تریش ہن، لہ وانہ دوو گیانی، شیوازی پیوہندی نہرینی و تہلاق.

مراجعة الأدبيات بخصوص العنف الأسري المعبر عنها من منظور النوع الاجتماعي

الملخص:

يتناول هذا الدراسة مراجعة للأدبيات السابقة المتعلقة بخصوص العنف المنزلي من المنظور النوع الاجتماعي. استناداً إلى الأدلة العلمية، فإن الموضوع الرئيسي للإشارة إلى المخاطر الحقيقية للعنف الأسري ضد المرأة. تم هذا المراجعة عن طريق المصادر العلمية للبحث عن العنف بين الجنسين وذلك لإيضاح دور العنف المشترك بينهما. فقد ظهرت بأن المرأة هي الأكثر ضحية و عرضة للعنف المنزلي مقارنة بالرجل، ومن أحد الأسباب للأسباب لهذا العنف تكمن في عدم إستقلالية المرأة إقتصادياً والتي تكون بدورها إلى إتاحة الفرصة للمعتدين بالإعتداء على المرأة في الحياة الزوجية، بالإضافة إلى الوضع الإقتصادي هناك مخاطر أخرى مثل الحمل، نوعية العلاقة السيئة وكذلك الطلاق.