Determinants of Intimate Partner Violence in Tanzania:
Evidence from the National Demographic and Health Survey

Abel Kinyondo[*], Magashi Joseph Ntegwa[†], and Asela Miho[‡]

Abstract
The prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) against ever married women in Tanzania remains high. This has an implication on development at both micro and macro level given the resulting socio-economic costs relating to IPV. It is for this reason that the present study intended to examine determinants of IPV among married women in Tanzania. Determinants are estimated by analysing the 2015/16 Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS) data using logistic regression. Results show that risk factors which are positively associating with IPV include male partner alcohol abuse, history of domestic violence in childhood, years in marriage, polygamy marriage and household size. Meanwhile, deterrent factors comprise of the age of married women and male partner's education. Furthermore, results indicate varied determinants of different forms of IPV across different zone in Tanzania. It is against this backdrop that we recommend for policies that ensure both women and men have equal access to quality education; amendments of relevant laws as well as raising IPV awareness using zone-specific determinants to discourage cultural norms that condone IPV.

Keywords*:* Gender-based violence; risk factors; protective factors; education; Tanzania.
JEL Classification Codes: J12, J16, I31

---

[*] Corresponding author, Senior Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dar- es-Salaam, Tanzania. Email: kinyondoabel@yahoo.com

[†]Assistant Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Email: jmagashi@gmail.com

[‡]Assistant Lecturer, Department of Economics, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, Email: aselamiho98@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) remains a major public health issue and a violation of human rights in the world (Campbell, 2002; Krug *et al.*, 2002). Statistics indicate that violence against women by their male partners are alarmingly high, with physical violence affecting between 10% and 69% of women (Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016). In Africa, the incidence is reported to be around 46% for women who are subjected to lifetime IPV and 12% to sexual assaults (McCloskey *et al.*, 2016). This study adopts the IPV definition from the UN Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women which defines IPV as:

> "any act of gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or psychological harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life" (UN, 1993).

Tanzania exhibits high prevalence of violence against women as about 40% of women aged 15-49 years reported to have experienced physical and sexual violence from their male partners in their life time (URT, 2016; Kapiga *et al.*, 2017). Furthermore, it has been reported that among four raped girls in the country, one is forced to marry her assailant which increases the likelihood of experiencing abuse in their marriage (Mccloskey *et al.*, 2016). For women who have been married at some point, it is reported that 44% have experienced physical and/or sexual violence from their current or most recent partner, and 37% of them have experienced the same violence from their partner in the 12 months prior to the survey (NBS and ICF Macro, 2016).

IPV is associated with pregnancy loss, psychological problems, unplanned pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases (Dunkle *et al.*, 2004; Roy *et al.*, 2019) and maternal morbidity and mortality (Silverman *et al.*, 2016). Moreover, it may result into a decrease in female labour participation and reduced productivity (Chegere and Karamagi, 2020). IPV may also affect women well-being as it limits their ability to work at their full potential, care for their families, and engage in different activities in the society (Kinyondo and Magashi, 2019; Chegere and Karamagi, 2020; Kinyondo and Joseph, 2021). It follows that, IPV can hinder realization of several sustainable development goals (SDGs) such as SDG 1 (ending poverty), SDG 2 (ending hunger and achieving food security), SDG 3 (ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages), SDG 4 (ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all) and SDG 5 (achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls).

Various national efforts to prevent IPV are in place. These include, stipulations to end domestic violence in the 2025 development vision (URT, 1999) and enactment of the Sexual Offence Special Provision Act 1998 (URT, 1998). In line with this, different interventions to empower women have been undertaken to address domestic violence in Tanzania. These include, Start-Awareness-Support-Action (SASA) (TAWREF and FOKUS, 2018), TATHMINI (Evaluation program) (Kelsey, Mihyo and Messner, 2016) and Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF) (Tanzania Social Action Fund, 2013).

Despite all these efforts, the prevalence of IPV is still alarming (Mccloskey, Williams and Larsen, 2005; Kapiga *et al.*, 2017; Vyas and Mbwambo, 2017). This could be attributed to cultural norms which constrain the implementation of the laws enacted by the government as IPV may be

considered normal in the society and thus can be tolerated. For example, the Marriage Act is silent on marital rape (Kelsey, Mihyo and Messner, 2016).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides for theoretical and empirical perspectives. Section 3 presents the methodology of this study. While section 4 reports empirical results, section 5 discusses the results and finally, section 5 concludes the study.

2. Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives

This study is informed by social theories of family violence and family life cycle theory. Social theories of family violence consist of control and resource theory of violence in families. The control theory asserts that, the perpetrator of violence uses power and tries to maintain his or her superiority in the family to make the victim submissive (Bostock *et al.,* 2002). In here the perpetrator practices actions of force, threats and violence to maintain his or her power against victims (Goode, 1971).

With regards to the resource theory, IPV is associated with the resource power of the perpetrator. In this case, having resources gives the perpetrator power to control the behaviour of the victim (Goode, 1971). Subsequently, violence is sustained through victims' belief that they cannot meet their basic needs and that of their children on their own unless they stay put in an abusive relationship (Wallace and Roberson, 2002).

The present study can also be understood from the family life cycle theory angle. Under this perspective, violent family experiences that couples faced since childhood can explain the presence of IPV in relationships. Moreover, cultural perspectives and multi-generational occurrences may provide an answer as to why and how violence occurs and repeats over time (Carter and McGoldrick, 1999).

Empirically, several studies have documented driving factors associated with IPV. For instance, women with low level of education are more likely to experience violence from their male partners (Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016; Mccloskey *et al.*, 2016; Kinyondo and Joseph, 2021). Moreover, women with male partners who drink alcohol are more likely to experience violence from their partners (Oyunbileg *et al.*, 2009; McCloskey *et al.*, 2016; Kinyondo and Joseph, 2021). Furthermore, poor households are associated with more violence against women (Oyunbileg *et al.*, 2009; McCloskey *et al.*, 2016; Dasre, Greulich and Ceren, 2017).

Meanwhile, studies show that women who resides in urban area are more likely to experience violence compared to their counterpart in rural areas (Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016; Kizilgol and Ipek, 2018). Also, women violence is positively associated with early childhood abuse (Mccloskey et al., 2016; Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016).

However, women's age is associated with conflicting consequences. Indeed, while on the one hand, young women are more likely to experience IPV (Kapiga *et al.*, 2017); older women have been found to be more likely to condone IPV (Kizilgol and Ipek, 2018). Other documented determinants of IPV include women accepting wife beating in some circumstances (Joseph and Msenda, 2020) and male partner having affairs with other women (Mccloskey, Williams and

Larsen, 2005)**.** Traditional gender role and family norms have also been noted to influence IPV (McCloskey *et al.*, 2016; Dasre, Greulich and Ceren, 2017).

The present study adds to the existing body of knowledge on IPV in that it firstly, uses a representative sample sourced from the Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS) conducted in 2015/16 unlike some of similar studies (e.g. Abramsky *et al.*, 2011; Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016; Kelsey, Mihyo and Messner, 2016; Kapiga *et al.*, 2017) which have used very small samples. Moreover, the present study differs from recent studies that have used bigger samples. For instance, while a study by Chegere and Karamagi (2020) addresses the issue around the link between IPV and labour market outcomes and that of Kinyondo and Joseph (2021) analyses how women's employment status affects IPV, the present study aims at presenting all possible determinants of IPV in Tanzania. It goes further by analysing determinants of IPV across different zones of residence of sampled women.

3. Methodology
3.1 The Conceptual Framework
Multidisciplinary approach to studying determinants of domestic violence started to be taken into account from mid-1990s. Previously theories that explained domestic violence borrowed from feminism, sociology, psychology and criminology and were strictly based on one discipline. Multidisciplinary thinking emerged after arguments from different theorists that violence is a result of combination of different factors of social ecology a move which lead to the violence ecological framework (Crowell and Burgess, 1996).

It follows that the present study adopts the integrated ecological framework of violence, which suggests that violence is influenced by a complex nature of interconnected factors across individual, relationship, community and macro-social levels (Heise, 1998). This is the most used framework in presenting factors that affects IPV (Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, Türkyılmaz and Heise, 2012). The framework is relevant as it provides the complete frameworks in explaining violence as it provides a means to assess necessary condition for violence to occur and factors which must be present for violence to occur. It assesses factors from each level of ecological framework that are necessary for violence to occur (Heise, 1998).

Specifically, the present study adapts this framework in trying to capture factors that may result into IPV in Tanzania. We do that in three levels. The first level covers the individual's history factors, the second level covers household factors and the third level entail the societal factors.

3.2 Data Sources and Analysis
The paper at hand uses the sixth Tanzania Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS) which was collected in 2015-2016. The TDHS collect information using household questionnaire, women questionnaire and men questionnaire. The Women questionnaire collected included, among others, information on IPV. The sample is drawn from two stages which intended to be the survey of the entire country covering both rural and urban areas in Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar. At the first stage 608 clusters which are enumeration areas (EAs) defined for the 2012 population and housing census were selected. In the second stage, a systematic selection of households was involved where 22 households were systematically selected from each cluster yielding a representative probability sample of 13,376 households for the 2015-16 TDHS (NBS and ICF Macro, 2016).

In accordance with WHO guidelines on ethical collection of information on domestic violence (WHO, 2001), only one eligible woman per household (15-49 years old) was randomly selected for the module on domestic violence, and the module was not administered if privacy could not be obtained. Subsequently, a total of 9,324 women were eligible for the violence module interview and 9,322 out of total eligible women were interviewed and only two women were excluded due to privacy issues. For the purpose of this study the sample size is 7,597 women aged 15-49 who have ever been in relationship/marriage. Empirical estimations were done using a sample of 5,842 women only after dropping variables with missing information.

Since the dependent variable is binary, logistic regression model is used in empirical estimations. The logistic regression is mostly used in the estimation of binary variable as it easy to compute and interpret (Barros and Hirakata, 2003). The logistic regression is specified as follows:

$$Log\left(\frac{P}{1-P}\right) = Log\left(\frac{a}{b}\right) = X\beta \tag{1}$$

Where: P is the probability of experiencing violence, X are the explanatory variables, $\frac{a}{b}$ is the odds of experiencing violence and the estimated odds ratio of a given covariate X is e^{β_i}. Moreover, survey weights were also used to compute descriptive statistics in order to obtain population estimates as well. In all the analyses, results were summarized under 95 percent confidence interval.

3.3 Variables Used

The dependent variable was constructed from a series of questions on physical, sexual and psychological violence experience of women from their partner/husband. Physical violence, psychological violence, sexual violence are the outcome variables which are coded as 1 if the respondent had experienced that form of violence. For each type of violence act, a binary outcome variable with 1 and 0 for experiencing or denying to ever experiencing violence, respectively is coded.

Physical violence includes the following questions: *Have you ever; been pushed, shake or had something thrown at you by your husband/partner?; Have you ever been slapped by your husband/partner?; Have you ever been punched by fist or hit by something harmful by your husband/partner?; Have you ever been kicked or drugged by your husband/partner?; Have you ever been strangled or burnt by your husband/partner?; Have you ever been threatened by knife/gun or other weapon by your husband/partner?; Have you ever had arm twisted or hair pulled by your husband/partner.* We constructed a binary variable capturing physical violence and was coded 1 for a yes response from any of the above questions and was coded 0 for a no response from any of the questions.

Sexual violence on the other hand includes the following questions: *Have you ever been physically forced to perform sexual acts respondent did not want to by your husband/partner? Have you ever been forced into unwanted sexual acts by your husband/partner and have you ever been physically forced into unwanted sex by your husband/partner?* For any of the three mentions question a yes

response was coded 1 which implies that a respondent experienced sexual violence and if no was coded 0.

Psychological violence was constructed from the following questions; *have you ever been humiliated by husband/partner? have you ever been threatened by harm with husband/partner? and ever been insulted or made to feel bad by husband/partner?* A yes response to any of these questions was coded as 1 agreeing that respondent experienced such kind of violence and no to all questions was coded 0 implying that respondent did not experience psychological violence. Finally, the constructed physical violence, sexual violence, and psychological violence was used to construct a dichotomous variable "domestic violence" where 1 implies have experience any of the three forms of violence and 0 otherwise.

Independent variables covering individual factors, household factors and community factors were identified following Heise (1998) as highlighted in our conceptual framework. In the end, the following independent variables were used: age of the respondent, place of residence, household wealth status, partner drinking alcohol, education level of the respondent and her partner, wife beating attitude, domestic violence history, years in marriage, polygamy, and household size.

4. Empirical results

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 shows that 46% of women in Tanzania still experience IPV. Specifically, women experience physical violence, sexual violence and psychological violence by 36%, 12% and 32%, respectively.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variable	# Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Domestic violence	7,597	0.46	0.50	0	1
Physical violence	7,597	0.36	0.48	0	1
Sexual violence	7,597	0.12	0.33	0	1
Emotional violence	7,597	0.32	0.47	0	1
Household size	7,597	5.68	3.00	1	48
Polygamy marriage	6,420	0.19	0.39	0	1
Years in marriage	7,597	12.43	8.70	0	38
Domestic violence history	6,948	0.37	0.48	0	1
Wife beating justified	7,572	0.16	0.36	0	1
Partner's education, years	6,451	6.34	3.20	0	17
Respondent's education, years	7,597	5.82	3.49	0	17
Partner drinks alcohol	7,597	0.31	0.46	0	1
Urban	7,597	0.27	0.44	0	1
Age respondent, years	7,597	31.63	8.49	15	49
Household wealth status					
Poorest	7,597	0.18	0.39	0	1
Poorer	7,597	0.19	0.39	0	1
Middle	7,597	0.21	0.40	0	1
Richer	7,597	0.23	0.42	0	1
Richest	7,597	0.20	0.40	0	1

Source: Author's Computation from 2015/16 TDHS Data

Moreover, results on Table 1 indicate that on average about 19% of women are in polygamous family. The average years a woman have been in marriage is 12 years. Also, 36% women have ever seen their father beating their mother and 15% of women accept wife beating in certain circumstances. Also, both respondents and their partner had average of primary level of education with an average year of schooling of 6.3 and 5.8, respectively. Also, 31% of women's partners drink alcohol.

4.2 Determinants of IPV

Empirical results shown in Table 2 shows the odds ratio estimations of determinants of different forms of violence (i.e., physical violence, emotional violence, sexual violence, and domestic violence). Results suggest that the age of the respondent is negatively correlated with all forms of violence. This implies that older women experience less violence in their marriages compared to younger women. The study also finds that male partner's education is negatively associated with domestic violence, psychological violence and physical violence.

Furthermore, women with male partner who drinks alcohol are more likely to experience all forms of violence. Also, women who have witnessed their fathers beating their mothers are more likely to experience IPV. Moreover, women who accept wife beating in certain circumstances are more likely to experience IPV. Moreover, many household members and polygamous marriage were found to be associated with an increase in the women's risk of violence from their male partner. In addition, women from middle income households were more likely to experience sexual violence compared to women from poorer households.

Table 2: Determinants of Domestic Violence

VARIABLES	(1) Domestic violence	(2) Psychological violence	(3) Physical violence	(4) Sexual violence
Household size	1.050***	1.070***	1.024**	1.055***
	(0.0131)	(0.0144)	(0.0119)	(0.0162)
Polygamy family				
No	Reference			
Yes	1.310***	1.503***	1.370***	1.181
	(0.122)	(0.152)	(0.125)	(0.156)
Years in marriage	1.041***	1.023**	1.046***	1.038**
	(0.0104)	(0.0109)	(0.0103)	(0.0165)
Violence history				
No	Reference			
Yes	2.617***	2.141***	2.281***	2.164***
	(0.185)	(0.156)	(0.169)	(0.243)
Justify wife beating				
No	Reference			
Yes	1.202**	1.048	1.268**	1.248*
	(0.106)	(0.0997)	(0.126)	(0.158)
Partner's education	0.963***	0.967***	0.974**	0.975
	(0.0115)	(0.0124)	(0.0130)	(0.0177)
Respondent's education	0.993	1.006	1.006	1.013
	(0.0113)	(0.0134)	(0.0112)	(0.0184)
Partner drinks alcohol				
No	Reference			
Yes	2.736***	2.370***	2.752***	2.373***
	(0.195)	(0.179)	(0.205)	(0.250)
Place of residence				
Rural	Reference			
Urban	1.011	1.135	1.100	0.929
	(0.105)	(0.144)	(0.115)	(0.135)
Age of respondent	0.950***	0.970***	0.946***	0.948***
	(0.00941)	(0.0105)	(0.00935)	(0.0156)
Wealth status				
Poorest	Reference			
Poorer	0.995	1.065	1.050	1.024
	(0.120)	(0.128)	(0.120)	(0.178)
Middle	1.136	1.043	1.131	1.317*
	(0.135)	(0.131)	(0.127)	(0.211)
Richer	1.098	0.947	1.002	1.180
	(0.137)	(0.130)	(0.126)	(0.208)
Richest	0.965	0.823	0.810	1.337
	(0.163)	(0.151)	(0.136)	(0.324)
Constant	1.117	0.363***	0.814	0.129***
	(0.262)	(0.0911)	(0.204)	(0.0481)
Observations	5,842	5,842	5,842	5,842

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1
Source: Author's computation from TDHS 2015/16 Data

4.3 Determinants of IPV by Zones of Residence

In order to compare obtained results, we report estimates of determinants of IPV by zones of respondents' residence. This enables us to check whether determinants of IPV differ across zone of residence. The paper uses the logistic Regression Model to analyses determinants of violence in eight zones: Western zone, Northern zone, Central zone, Southern highlands zone, Southern zone, South West highlands zone, Lake zone, Eastern zone and Zanzibar.

Findings from Table 3 suggest that large household size increases likelihood of IPV in Western zone while it decreases likelihood of violence in Zanzibar. Moreover, women in polygamy marriage are more likely to experience IPV in the Western zone, Northern zone and South West highlands. In addition, women with violence history are in high likelihood of experiencing IPV in all zones except Western zone. Furthermore, women residing in urban area in Southern highland are more likely to experience IPV while women in urban in Zanzibar are less likely to experience violence. Age of the respondent is negatively associated with IPV in Western zone, Lake zone and Eastern zone. Also, women in middle wealth status household in Southern highland and Lake zone are more likely to experience IPV. In the Lake zone, women from richest households are more likely to experience IPV than their counterpart from poor households. Attitudes towards IPV seems to make the Western zone worst affected IPV region in Tanzania.

Table 4 presents analyses of the determinants of psychological violence. Results suggest that women in polygamy marriage and from Western, Northern and Eastern zone are more likely to experience psychological violence. On other hand, household size is negatively associated with psychological violence in Zanzibar. Moreover, women with violence history in all zones except Southern zone and Zanzibar are more likely to experience violence compared to women with no violence history. Likelihood of psychological violence is higher among women from Central and Southern highlands zone and justify wife beating in certain circumstances. Increase in partner's education increases likelihood of psychological violence in Western zone while decreases likelihood of violence in Eastern zone. Further, women with male partner who drinks alcohol increases likelihood of psychological violence in all zones except Western zone. Women from urban Southern highlands zone are more likely to experience psychological violence. Women from middle wealth status household and who resides in the southern higher highland are more likely to experience violence while more violence is more likely to be experience by women from richer wealth status household residing in Northern zone.

Table 5 presents results on determinants of physical violence. Findings suggest that household size is positively associated with physical violence in the Western zone while it is negatively associated in the Central zone. Moreover, women from polygamy marriage residing in Western, Northern, South West highlands and Eastern zones are more likely to face physical violence. Furthermore, women with more years in marriage have more likelihood to face physical violence in the Lake and Eastern zone. Also, women with violence history have higher likelihood of physical violence in all zones. Women who reside in the Western zone and accept wife beating in some circumstances are at higher risk of physical violence compared to women who don't accept wife beating. Also, more physical violence is more likely to be experienced by women from the Western zone while less violence for women in the Southern violence. Less violence is more likely to be experienced as age of the respondent increases for women in the Lake zone and Eastern zone. Less violence for women from richest households is experienced in the Southern West highlands zone.

Table 6 presents results on determinants of sexual violence. There is more sexual violence among women in the Western and Lake zone as the household size increases. Less sexual violence is experienced as household size increases in the Northern zone. Polygamy marriage is correlated with more sexual violence for women in the Eastern zone. Sexual violence is more likely to face women in the Lake and Eastern zone while less sexual violence is facing women in the Central zone. Women with violence history are associated with more sexual violence in the Western, Southern highlands, South west highlands, Lake and Eastern zones. Increase in partner's education is correlated with less violence in the Central and Eastern zones. Women with male partner who drinks alcohol are more likely to experience sexual violence in all zones except Southern zone. Meanwhile, sexual violence is likely to occur for women from middle wealth quantile household in he Northern and Southern zone; richer wealth quantile household (in the Northern zone) and richest wealth quantile household in the Northern and Lake zone. Increase in respondents age increases violence in the Central zone but decreases it in the South West highland, Lake and Eastern zones. Lastly, women from urban area in the Southern highland are more likely to experience violence compared to women from rural areas.

Table 3: Determinant of IPV by Zones of Residence

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands zone	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Household size	1.124***	0.950	0.919	0.945	0.982	1.049	1.018	0.923	0.894**
	(0.0441)	(0.0616)	(0.0527)	(0.0411)	(0.0763)	(0.0506)	(0.0203)	(0.0467)	(0.0503)
Polygamy family									
No	Reference								
Yes	2.142**	2.021**	1.156	1.000	0.813	1.978***	0.863	1.741	1.458
	(0.762)	(0.585)	(0.275)	(0.296)	(0.304)	(0.441)	(0.155)	(0.580)	(0.455)
Years in marriage	1.079*	1.033	1.016	1.027	1.013	0.999	1.050**	1.045*	1.077
	(0.0424)	(0.0286)	(0.0310)	(0.0288)	(0.0419)	(0.0429)	(0.0195)	(0.0275)	(0.0529)
Violence history									
No	Reference								
Yes	3.832***	2.450***	1.964***	2.224***	2.047**	2.874***	2.573***	2.165***	2.542**
	(0.875)	(0.622)	(0.374)	(0.518)	(0.612)	(0.809)	(0.337)	(0.427)	(0.898)
Justify wife beating									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.600*	1.069	1.152	1.522	1.424	1.202	1.117	1.084	1.160
	(0.384)	(0.341)	(0.251)	(0.462)	(0.499)	(0.372)	(0.184)	(0.327)	(0.756)
Partner's education	1.061	0.979	0.937**	0.961	0.982	0.979	0.970	0.889**	0.960
	(0.0405)	(0.0308)	(0.0295)	(0.0413)	(0.0601)	(0.0422)	(0.0214)	(0.0394)	(0.0392)
Respondent's education	0.962	0.978	1.003	0.958	1.018	0.954	1.001	1.014	1.018
	(0.0325)	(0.0299)	(0.0346)	(0.0373)	(0.0470)	(0.0323)	(0.0221)	(0.0398)	(0.0376)
Partner drinks alcohol									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.576	3.332***	2.752***	3.683***	3.168***	2.619***	2.353***	2.774***	13.24***
	(0.508)	(0.763)	(0.464)	(0.695)	(0.947)	(0.455)	(0.310)	(0.670)	(6.778)

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands zone	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Place of residence									
Rural	Reference								
Urban	2.290	1.013	0.899	1.843*	0.669	1.079	0.798	0.978	0.448*
	(1.251)	(0.349)	(0.345)	(0.614)	(0.185)	(0.339)	(0.148)	(0.258)	(0.186)
Age of respondent	0.917**	0.965	1.008	0.962	0.971	0.991	0.958**	0.949*	0.916
	(0.0370)	(0.0285)	(0.0276)	(0.0291)	(0.0405)	(0.0354)	(0.0173)	(0.0268)	(0.0491)
Wealth status									
Poorest	Reference								
Poorer	1.572	1.347	0.820	0.973	1.049	0.879	0.890	0.816	0.146
	(0.548)	(0.491)	(0.198)	(0.412)	(0.361)	(0.373)	(0.168)	(0.593)	(0.189)
Middle	1.320	0.965	1.020	1.953*	0.680	1.171	1.536*	0.950	0.266
	(0.419)	(0.297)	(0.300)	(0.738)	(0.233)	(0.336)	(0.334)	(0.762)	(0.297)
Richer	0.792	1.582	0.974	1.650	1.131	0.957	1.375	1.459	0.448
	(0.470)	(0.451)	(0.249)	(0.679)	(0.368)	(0.314)	(0.366)	(0.904)	(0.504)
Richest	1.494	1.094	0.640	1.324	0.613	0.643	2.073**	1.348	0.598
	(0.973)	(0.553)	(0.300)	(0.764)	(0.379)	(0.275)	(0.710)	(0.892)	(0.673)
Constant	1.048	0.536	0.638	1.051	0.845	0.422	1.683	2.193	3.049
	(0.919)	(0.437)	(0.330)	(0.822)	(0.663)	(0.303)	(0.814)	(1.853)	(4.378)
Observations	451	537	620	552	349	609	1,306	591	827

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: Determinant of Psychological Violence by Zones of Residence

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Household size	1.046	1.012	0.984	0.925	0.961	1.034	1.027	0.973	0.869*
	(0.0327)	(0.0681)	(0.0618)	(0.0555)	(0.100)	(0.0381)	(0.0205)	(0.0636)	(0.0629)
Polygamy family									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.893*	1.859*	1.434	1.595	0.661	1.511	1.286	2.373**	1.343
	(0.699)	(0.585)	(0.347)	(0.474)	(0.314)	(0.420)	(0.238)	(0.935)	(0.492)
Years in marriage	1.052	1.024	0.960	1.026	1.013	0.978	1.036	1.019	1.117
	(0.0366)	(0.0288)	(0.0304)	(0.0329)	(0.0502)	(0.0393)	(0.0223)	(0.0291)	(0.0762)
Violence history									
No	Reference								
Yes	3.246***	2.245***	1.552*	1.911**	1.305	1.774**	1.802***	2.344***	1.734
	(0.815)	(0.579)	(0.360)	(0.535)	(0.416)	(0.442)	(0.221)	(0.490)	(0.904)
Justify wife beating									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.306	0.974	1.539*	1.769**	1.254	0.823	0.831	0.942	0.336
	(0.342)	(0.291)	(0.354)	(0.500)	(0.463)	(0.285)	(0.142)	(0.344)	(0.325)
Partner's education	1.074**	0.965	0.956	0.954	0.988	0.927	0.980	0.892**	0.932
	(0.0350)	(0.0440)	(0.0342)	(0.0453)	(0.0710)	(0.0425)	(0.0211)	(0.0421)	(0.0432)
Respondent's education	0.965	1.015	1.024	0.965	1.064	0.982	0.999	1.045	1.024
	(0.0406)	(0.0428)	(0.0396)	(0.0485)	(0.0610)	(0.0376)	(0.0253)	(0.0478)	(0.0508)
Partner drinks alcohol									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.501	2.617***	3.516***	2.911***	2.421**	1.854**	2.069***	3.194***	12.08***
	(0.470)	(0.679)	(0.806)	(0.692)	(0.791)	(0.488)	(0.262)	(0.780)	(7.245)
Place of residence									
Rural	Reference								
Urban	1.849	1.280	1.516	1.748*	0.769	1.467	0.869	1.126	0.573
	(1.150)	(0.507)	(0.669)	(0.553)	(0.381)	(0.713)	(0.202)	(0.472)	(0.266)
Age of respondent	0.937*	0.987	1.044	0.974	0.987	1.027	0.968	0.984	0.899

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
	(0.0336)	(0.0283)	(0.0333)	(0.0328)	(0.0467)	(0.0370)	(0.0211)	(0.0301)	(0.0694)
Wealth status									
Poorest	Reference								
Poorer	1.007	1.699	1.119	1.222	1.270	1.006	0.842	0.865	0.058
	(0.330)	(0.836)	(0.276)	(0.433)	(0.561)	(0.335)	(0.160)	(0.607)	(0.042)
Middle	0.943	1.372	1.324	1.700*	0.664	1.299	1.065	0.619	0.178
	(0.377)	(0.567)	(0.441)	(0.536)	(0.269)	(0.462)	(0.194)	(0.477)	(0.198)
Richer	0.549	1.908*	0.892	1.547	0.771	0.696	1.147	1.014	0.347
	(0.310)	(0.722)	(0.222)	(0.575)	(0.485)	(0.278)	(0.256)	(0.684)	(0.408)
Richest	0.935	1.082	0.506	1.448	1.003	0.625	1.532	0.761	0.386
	(0.618)	(0.602)	(0.314)	(0.758)	(0.893)	(0.375)	(0.498)	(0.556)	(0.455)
Constant	1.203	0.0892**	0.0716***	0.350	0.218	0.151***	0.894	0.382	4.532
	(0.948)	(0.0863)	(0.0497)	(0.288)	(0.201)	(0.102)	(0.458)	(0.335)	(7.896)
Observations	451	537	620	552	349	609	1,306	591	763

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 5: Determinant of Physical Violence by Zones of Residence

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Household size	1.082***	0.961	0.895*	0.968	0.903	1.019	1.006	0.973	0.885
	(0.0276)	(0.0700)	(0.0526)	(0.0399)	(0.0947)	(0.0424)	(0.0189)	(0.0542)	(0.0696)
Polygamy family									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.667*	2.327***	1.007	0.813	1.018	2.010***	1.121	2.206**	1.591
	(0.502)	(0.692)	(0.254)	(0.253)	(0.405)	(0.491)	(0.183)	(0.798)	(0.635)
Years in marriage	1.051	1.021	1.039	1.039	1.001	0.998	1.059***	1.061**	0.969
	(0.0407)	(0.0311)	(0.0323)	(0.0326)	(0.0436)	(0.0394)	(0.0177)	(0.0240)	(0.0482)
Violence history									
No	Reference								
Yes	2.571***	2.198***	1.867***	1.766***	2.066**	2.622***	2.216***	1.894***	2.884**
	(0.574)	(0.554)	(0.380)	(0.370)	(0.690)	(0.728)	(0.288)	(0.401)	(1.404)
Justify wife beating									
No	Reference								
Yes	2.154*	0.919	1.169	1.283	0.985	1.528	1.199	1.004	2.108
	(0.829)	(0.320)	(0.289)	(0.440)	(0.388)	(0.440)	(0.213)	(0.325)	(1.735)
Partner's education	1.025	0.962	0.932**	0.947	1.030	0.980	0.997	0.924*	0.982
	(0.0480)	(0.0304)	(0.0316)	(0.0376)	(0.0610)	(0.0521)	(0.0251)	(0.0422)	(0.0479)
Respondent's education	1.031	0.970	1.019	0.964	0.994	0.975	1.024	0.990	0.989
	(0.0331)	(0.0335)	(0.0345)	(0.0380)	(0.0485)	(0.0441)	(0.0216)	(0.0351)	(0.0483)

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Partner drinks alcohol									
No	Reference								
Yes	2.221***	3.010***	2.431***	3.010***	2.948***	2.882***	2.149***	3.246***	18.90***
	(0.595)	(0.633)	(0.575)	(0.589)	(0.940)	(0.486)	(0.273)	(0.906)	(9.731)
Place of residence									
Rural	Reference								
Urban	2.392**	1.389	0.727	1.741	0.564*	1.084	0.971	1.021	0.530
	(0.995)	(0.506)	(0.227)	(0.584)	(0.169)	(0.345)	(0.203)	(0.283)	(0.273)
Age of respondent	0.936	0.965	0.991	0.959	0.978	0.982	0.950***	0.920***	1.012
	(0.0377)	(0.0307)	(0.0283)	(0.0295)	(0.0427)	(0.0338)	(0.0156)	(0.0234)	(0.0594)
Wealth status									
Poorest	Reference								
Poorer	1.610	1.585	0.751	0.999	0.992	0.708	1.089	1.245	0.004
	(0.545)	(0.598)	(0.196)	(0.425)	(0.368)	(0.272)	(0.207)	(0.741)	(0.001)
Middle	0.961	1.160	1.039	1.648	0.793	1.064	1.393	1.363	1.020
	(0.292)	(0.446)	(0.306)	(0.660)	(0.289)	(0.318)	(0.307)	(0.889)	(0.025)
Richer	0.872	1.437	1.014	1.240	1.209	0.839	0.894	2.194	0.016
	(0.473)	(0.512)	(0.282)	(0.556)	(0.559)	(0.252)	(0.222)	(1.235)	(0.051)
Richest	0.653	0.878	0.982	0.963	0.663	0.375**	1.313	1.876	0.019
	(0.337)	(0.489)	(0.453)	(0.591)	(0.445)	(0.175)	(0.427)	(1.149)	(0.017)
Constant	0.379	0.511	0.740	0.996	0.676	0.518	0.892	1.609	1.013
	(0.318)	(0.419)	(0.542)	(0.759)	(0.619)	(0.372)	(0.414)	(1.357)	(0.021)
Observations	451	537	620	552	349	609	1,306	591	827

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 6: Determinant of Sexual Violence by Zones of Residence

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Household size	1.101**	0.703**	0.958	0.878	1.023	1.021	1.057**	0.905	1.068
	(0.0434)	(0.105)	(0.0571)	(0.0873)	(0.0907)	(0.0363)	(0.0236)	(0.0776)	(0.0692)
Polygamy family									
No	Reference								
Yes	0.864	2.410	0.915	1.650	0.870	0.891	1.071	6.344***	1.051
	(0.262)	(1.282)	(0.446)	(0.630)	(0.621)	(0.317)	(0.218)	(3.923)	(0.622)
Years in marriage	0.986	1.006	0.903**	1.020	1.081	1.070	1.082***	1.107**	1.005
	(0.0415)	(0.0451)	(0.0387)	(0.0410)	(0.0598)	(0.0467)	(0.0266)	(0.0546)	(0.0756)
Violence history									
No	Reference								
Yes	3.839***	1.715	1.305	1.883*	2.153	2.553***	1.874***	2.177*	2.233
	(1.274)	(0.657)	(0.467)	(0.655)	(1.071)	(0.817)	(0.377)	(0.985)	(1.275)
Justify wife beating									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.497	1.289	1.356	1.711	0.891	1.622	1.302	0.019	1.155
	(0.478)	(0.764)	(0.509)	(0.690)	(0.494)	(0.550)	(0.273)	(0.548)	(1.184)
Partner's education	1.032	0.858	0.881**	0.980	0.951	0.944	1.039	0.856**	0.961
	(0.0456)	(0.0923)	(0.0438)	(0.0657)	(0.0965)	(0.0644)	(0.0293)	(0.0587)	(0.0969)
Respondent's education	1.075	1.018	1.026	0.902	0.998	0.980	0.989	1.136*	0.922
	(0.0507)	(0.0916)	(0.0481)	(0.0607)	(0.0924)	(0.0586)	(0.0324)	(0.0748)	(0.0698)
Partner drinks alcohol									
No	Reference								
Yes	1.924*	4.044***	1.912*	2.536***	1.454	2.533***	2.273***	1.946*	27.76***
	(0.681)	(1.866)	(0.647)	(0.754)	(0.755)	(0.749)	(0.406)	(0.695)	(13.89)
Place of residence									
Rural	Reference								
Urban	1.934	0.715	0.726	2.434**	0.226	0.601	1.182	1.072	0.487
	(1.098)	(0.291)	(0.335)	(0.922)	(0.265)	(0.276)	(0.263)	(0.748)	(0.282)

VARIABLES	(1) Western zone	(2) Northern zone	(3) Central zone	(4) Southern highlands zone	(5) Southern zone	(6) South West highlands	(7) Lake zone	(8) Eastern zone	(9) Zanzibar zone
Age of respondent	0.990	1.023	1.104**	0.969	0.926	0.899**	0.923***	0.877**	0.914
	(0.0447)	(0.0433)	(0.0501)	(0.0368)	(0.0503)	(0.0427)	(0.0213)	(0.0490)	(0.0724)
Wealth status									
Poorest	Reference								
Poorer	0.898	11.29	1.376	1.719	0.954	0.678	0.862	0.522	0.054
	(0.367)	(17.19)	(0.767)	(0.887)	(0.446)	(0.338)	(0.211)	(0.630)	(0.410)
Middle	1.583	1.762**	0.845	2.706**	0.394	1.379	1.431	0.139	1.191
	(0.695)	(1.60)	(0.466)	(1.151)	(0.231)	(0.441)	(0.340)	(0.149)	(0.381)
Richer	0.611	2.940***	0.621	2.083	1.034	1.270	1.102	0.462	1.347
	(0.349)	(8.44)	(0.346)	(1.062)	(0.684)	(0.592)	(0.299)	(0.295)	(0.374)
Richest	0.331	5.067**	0.950	1.025	0.857	1.338	2.154*	1.122	0.0182
	(0.306)	(6.331)	(0.762)	(0.692)	(1.373)	(1.089)	(0.927)	(0.963)	(O.322)
Constant	0.0323***	0.00572***	0.0191***	0.199*	0.428	1.042	0.168***	1.654	0.060
	(0.0335)	(0.0101)	(0.0227)	(0.190)	(0.433)	(1.046)	(0.0963)	(2.257)	(0.045)
Observations	451	537	620	552	349	609	1,306	469	827

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

5. Discussion

Findings from this study show that physical violence is more prevalent in Tanzania (36%) followed by psychological violence (32%) and sexual violence (12%). This differ from the previous studies that indicated higher prevalence of psychological violence (Adjah and Agbemafle, 2016; Jahromi *et al.*, 2016). This may be a result of social cultural variation and methodological complexities that complicates psychological violence.

Moreover, results show that domestic violence is negatively correlated with an increase in women's age. This implies that older age acts as a protective factor to women against experiencing IPV. The possible explanation could be younger women are less familiar with how to handle possible IPV. These results are consistent with the findings from studies (Kapiga *et al.*, 2017; Alangea *et al.*, 2018; Alquaiz *et al.*, 2021). It must however be noted that these results contradict those found by Ipek & Kizilgol (2018) who found out that domestic violence is positively correlated with an increase in women's age.

Furthermore, women from the middle-income households are significantly more likely to experience sexual violence compared to women from poorest household. This contradicts findings from other study which signify that women from poorest household experience more IPV (Rahman, Hoque and Makinoda, 2011; Mccloskey *et al.*, 2016; Dasre, Greulich and Ceren, 2017). Richer background could thus be a threat to men's perceived autonomy in Tanzania something which may trigger IPV. Also, a woman with husband who drink alcohol are significantly more to experience all forms of violence. This could be due to the fact that alcohol use is known to have impact on mental wellness that results into abnormal responses and actions that may lead into violence acts. This is in line with previous studies which indicated that husband drunkenness increases the risk of domestic violence against women (Chegere and Karamagi, 2020; Kinyondo and Joseph, 2021).

Meanwhile, women who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers are more likely to experience all kinds of violence compared to women who have never had that experience. This could be because a woman with such experience may consider violence as a normal thing that can be tolerated. This is consistent with various other studies who found that history of violence from women's parents increases the likelihood of domestic violence against women (Mccloskey *et al.*, 2016; Alangea *et al.*, 2018). Also, increase in male partner's year of education decreases the women's likelihood to experience IPV. It appears that more education could mean more awareness on rights of women, the impact of IPV and perhaps income that ultimately derail IPV. Similar previous studies also found that increase in male partner's years of education lower the possibility of domestic violence (Sambisa *et al.*, 2011; Alangea *et al.*, 2018)

With regards to variations in experiencing various forms of violence, the study found that drivers of violence among women differs by zone of residence of the women and by forms of violence. The variation could be a result of traditional gender role and family norms that exist among women as documented by various studies (e.g. Mccloskey *et al.*, 2016; Dasre, Greulich and Ceren, 2017).

6. Conclusion

This study was intended to examine determinants of IPV among ever-married women in Tanzania. using the national representative sample. It adds to existing literature in that it not only uses a nationally representative sample but also it innovatively analyses zonal differences in IPV patterns.

Findings from this study shows that IPV continues to be rampant in Tanzania. Results show that the age of the respondent and education of the respondent's partners are negatively correlated with IPV. Moreover, male partner alcohol abuse, acceptance of wife beating by women, domestic violence history, polygamous marriage, years in marriage and household size are positively correlated with domestic violence.

To this end, we recommend for more awareness on IPV. We also recommend for access to education to both men and women something that shall not only prevent early marriages but also most likely reduce financial strains in relationships. Moreover, there should be improvement of laws and multi-sectoral protection services to prevent IPV. Finally, we recommend that awareness about IPV be raised using zone-specific determinants so that to discourage cultural norms that propagate IPV in Tanzania.

References

Abramsky, T., Watts, C. H., Garcia-Moreno, C., Devries, K., Kiss, L., Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A. F. M., & Heise, L. (2011). What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic Violence. *BMC Public Health*, *11*(109). https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-109

Adjah, E. S. O., & Agbemafle, I. (2016). Determinants of domestic violence against women in Ghana. *BMC Public Health*, *16*(368). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-016-3041-x

Alangea, D. O., Addo-Lartey, A. A., Sikweyiya, Y., Chirwa, D. E., Coker-Appiah, D., Jewkes, R., & Adanu, R. M. K. (2018). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence among women in four districts of the central region of Ghana: Baseline findings from a cluster randomised controlled trial. *PLoS ONE*, *13*(7). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0200874

Alquaiz, A. M., Almuneef, M., Kazi, A., & Almeneessier, A. (2021). Social determinants of domestic violence among Saudi married women in Riyadh, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *36*(3–4), NP1561-1585NP. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517746128

Barros, A. J., & Hirakata, V. N. (2003). Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *3*(21). https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-3-21

Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet*, *359*, 1331–1336. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08336-8

Carter, E., & McGoldrick, M. (1999). *Overview: The expanded family life cycle: individual, family, and social perspectives* (3rd ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Chegere, M. J., & Karamagi, I. J. (2020). Intimate partner violence and labour market outcomes in Tanzania. *African Journal of Economic Review*, *8*(2), 82–101.

Crowell, N. A., & Burgess, A. W. (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. National Academic Press.

Dasre, A., Greulich, A., & Ceren, I. (2017). *Combating domestic violence against women in Turkey. The role of women's economic empowerment*.

Dunkle, K. L., Jewkes, R. K., Brown, H. C., Gray, G. E., McIntryre, J. A., & Harlow, S. D. (2004). Gender-based violence , relationship power, and risk of HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa. *Lancet*, *363*(9419), 1415–1421. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(04)16098-4

Goode, W. J. (1971). Force and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *33*(4), 624–636. https://doi.org/10.2307/349435

Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework. *Violence Against Women*, *4*(3), 262–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801298004003002

Jahromi, M. K., Jamali, S., Koshkaki, A. R., & Javadpour, S. (2016). Prevalence and risk factors of domestic violence against women by their husbands in Iran. *Global Journal of Health*

Science, *8*(5), 175–183. https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v8n5p175

Joseph, M., & Msenda, N. (2020). Women's attitudes towards wife-beating in Tanzania : Evidence from the 2015/16 National Demographic and Health Survey. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Sciences*, *9*(1), 92–110.

Kapiga, S., Harvey, S., Muhammad, A. K., Stöckl, H., Mshana, G., Hashim, R., Hansen, C., Lees, S., & Watts, C. (2017). Prevalence of intimate partner violence and abuse and associated factors among women enrolled into a cluster randomised trial in northwestern Tanzania. *BMC Public Health*, *17*(190). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4119-9

Kelsey, S., Mihyo, Z., & Messner, L. (2016). *Lessons from the gender-based violence initiative in Tanzania*.

Kinyondo, A., & Joseph, M. (2021). Women's employment status and domestic violence in Tanzania: How do they link? *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *30*(2), 216–225. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsw.12440

Kinyondo, A., & Magashi, J. (2019). The impact of cash transfers on women's empowerment: The case of the Tanzania Social Action Fund. *Poverty & Public Policy*, *11*(3), 178–204. https://doi.org/10.1002/pop4.256

Kizilgol, O. A., & Ipek, E. (2018). An analysis on domestic violence against women in Turkey: Multinomial Logit Model. *Business and Economics Research Journal*, *9*(3), 715–733. https://doi.org/10.20409/berj.2018.133

Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (2002). *World report on violence and health*.

McCloskey, L. A., Boonzaier, F., Steinbrenner, S. Y., & Hunter, T. (2016). Determinants of Intimate Partner Violence in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Review of Prevention and Intervention Programs. *Partner Abuse*, *7*(3), 277–315. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.7.3.277

Mccloskey, L. A., Williams, C., & Larsen, U. (2005). Gender inequality and intimate partner violence among women in Moshi , Tanzania. *International Family Planning Perspectives*, *31*(3), 124–130. https://doi.org/10.1363/3112405

NBS, & ICF Macro. (2016). *Tanzania demographic and health Survey and malaria indicator survey 2015-2016*.

Oyunbileg, S., Sumberzul, N., Udval, N., Wang, J.-D., & Janes, C. R. (2009). Prevalence and Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Mongolian Women. *Journal of Women's Health*, *18*(11), 1873–1880. https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2008.1226

Rahman, M., Hoque, A., & Makinoda, S. (2011). Intimate partner violence against women : Is women empowerment a reducing factor? A study from a national Bangladeshi sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, *26*(5), 411–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-011-9375-3

Roy, S., Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., & Ahmed, A. (2019). Transfers, behavior change communication, and intimate partner violence: Postprogram evidence from rural Bangladesh. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *101*(5), 865–877. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00791

Sambisa, W., Angeles, G., Lance, P. M., Naved, R. T., & Thornton, J. (2011). Prevalence and correlates of physical spousal violence against women in slum and nonslum areas of urban Bangladesh. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(13), 2592–2618. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510388282

Silverman, J. G., Balaiah, D., Ritter, J., Dasgupta, A., Boyce, S. C., Decker, M. R., Naik, D. D., Nair, S., Saggurti, N., & Raj, A. (2016). Maternal morbidity associated with violence and maltreatment from husbands and in-laws: findings from Indian slum communities. *Reproductive Health*, *13*(109). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-016-0223-z

Tanzania Social Action Fund. (2013). *Productive social safety net (PSSN) operational manual*.

TAWREF, & FOKUS. (2018). *SASA ! End line study report for Kigoma-Ujiji and Magu districts, Tanzania*.

UN. (1993). *Declaration on the elimination of violence against women*.

URT. (1998). *The Sexual Offence Special Provision Act 1998*.

URT. (1999). *The Tanzania Development Vision 2025*.

URT. (2016). *National Plan of Action to End Violence Against Women and Children in Tanzania 2017/18-2021/22*.

Vyas, S., & Mbwambo, J. (2017). Physical partner violence, women's economic status and help-seeking behaviour in Dar es Salaam and Mbeya, Tanzania. *Global Health Action*, *10*(1290426), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/16549716.2017.1290426

Wallace, H., & Roberson, C. (2002). *Family violence: legal, medical, and social perspectives* (3rd ed.).

Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu, I., Türkyılmaz, A. S., & Heise, L. (2012). What puts women at risk of violence from their husbands? Findings from a large, nationally representative survey in Turkey. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(14), 2743–2769. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260512438283