

KINSHIP TIES AND VIOLENCE AGAINST MARRIED WOMEN IN GHANA

by

© Alice P. Sedziafa

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Gender Studies

Department of Gender Studies, Faculty of Arts

Memorial University of Newfoundland

September, 2014

St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador

ABSTRACT

The socialization of men and women in Ghana is understood as conferring either patrilineal or matrilineal rights, privileges and responsibilities. Yet, previous studies that explored the causes of domestic and marital violence in sub-Saharan Africa and Ghana paid less attention to kin group affiliation and how the power dynamics within such groups affect marital violence. Using the most recent Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS) conducted in 2008, and applying Ordinary Least Squares, this study examined what influences physical, sexual and emotional violence among matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups. Results show that patrilineal ever-married women experience more physical and sexual violence than matrilineal ever-married women. However, matrilineal ever-married women experience more male partner emotional violence than patrilineal ever-married women. Male dominance is the strongest independent predictor of physical, sexual and emotional violence. Also, women with higher education experienced reduced levels of sexual violence in patrilineal societies compared to those with no education.

Contextualizing these findings within feminist scholarships on domestic violence against women, they suggest that interventions aimed at eradicating the occurrence of domestic violence in Ghanaian communities should appreciate the dynamics of kinship norms.

Keywords: Ghana, Martial violence, Kinship, Women, feminist scholarship

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank Memorial University of Newfoundland (MUN) for giving me the opportunity to pursue Master of Gender Studies in their esteemed institution, and making resources available for the completion of this thesis.

I am also overwhelmed by the tremendous support from my co-supervisors, Dr. Sonja Boon of the Department of Gender Studies and Dr. Eric Tenkorang of the Department of Sociology. I am grateful for their intellectual expertise, encouragement, critical and engaging guidance throughout my Master of Gender Studies program and the completion of this thesis. I want to further take this opportunity to express my warmest appreciation to faculty members at the Department of Gender Studies for their intellectual contributions in various ways.

I am touched and humbled beyond words at the love, understanding and moral support expressed by family and partner, Kwame Ananie and I want to say a big 'thank you'. I admire the motivation and encouragement you have provided during my toughest times in graduate school.

I would also like to appreciate the academic and social networks which have been important in completing this thesis: Yuji, Collins, Ilaria, Sarah, and Judit, in the Departments of Sociology and Gender Studies respectively.

Finally, this research was ably supported by SSHRC Insight Development no: 430-2013-0699 and the VP SSHRC grant no: 201379 both held by Dr. Eric Y Tenkorang.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF TABLES	V
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	1
1.2 KINSHIP IN THE GHANAIAI CONTEXT.....	2
1.3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON MARITAL VIOLENCE.....	4
1.3.1 <i>Marital violence as Violence against women</i>	4
1.3.2 <i>Marital Violence: Definition and Global Prevalence</i>	7
1.3.3 <i>Marital Violence: Prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa</i>	10
1.3.4 <i>Marital violence: The Ghanaian Case</i>	12
CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY	20
2.0 METHODOLOGY	20
2.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL TENETS OF FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP	21
2.2 METHODOLOGICAL TENETS OF FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP.....	25
2.2.1 <i>Feminist reflexivity</i>	25
2.2.1 <i>Methods</i>	29
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	41
3.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	41
3.1 NORTH AMERICAN FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	41
3.1.1 <i>Historical North American feminist approaches</i>	42
3.1.2 <i>Contemporary North American feminist thought</i>	45
3.2 AFRICAN FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	48
3.3 THE SOCIOCULTURAL INSTITUTION OF KINSHIP.....	50
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	54
4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	54
4.1 RESULTS.....	54
4.2 DISCUSSION/ ANALYSIS	59
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS.....	67
5.0 CONCLUSION	67
5.1 OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.....	67
5.2 OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK.....	68
5.3 OVERVIEW OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	69
5.4 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS	69
5.5 IMPLICATIONS	70
5.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....	71
REFERENCES	74
APPENDIX.....	90

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: A univariate distribution of selected dependent and independent variables.
- Table 2: Zero-order OLS or Bivariate coefficients for physical and sexual violence among women aged 15-49.
- Table 3: Multivariate OLS coefficients for physical violence among women aged 15-49.
- Table 4: Multivariate OLS coefficients for sexual violence among women aged 15-49.
- Table 5: Multivariate OLS coefficients for emotional violence among women aged 15-49.

CHAPTER 1: Introduction

1.0 INTRODUCTION

My thesis examines married women's experiences of male partner violence in Ghana. More specifically, analyzing data from the most recent Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS, 2008), I examine marital violence along matrilineal and patrilineal kinship lines and critically assess the socio-cultural norms that inform the prevalence of this form of violence along the two lineages.

1.1 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Before I discuss the literature on kinship and marital violence in Ghana, I begin by situating the research questions that guide my work. In my thesis, I seek to answer the following questions: (i) How are the concepts of patriliney and matriliney understood from the Ghanaian perspective? (ii) What roles do power and cultural privilege play among women belonging to different lineage ties? And, (iii) How does kinship affect women's understandings and experiences of domestic violence? I will also examine the extent and level of male domination and control of women in both lineages. In addition to this, I intend to examine the differences, if any, of women's justification of marital violence in both lineages.

1.2 KINSHIP IN THE GHANAIAAN CONTEXT

As a country in sub-Saharan Africa, Ghana is located on the West Africa coastline (Konadu, 2010). In the 2010 population census, Ghana's population was estimated at approximately 25 million, with females comprising 51 percent of the total population and males making up 49 percent (Ghana Statistical Service, 2012). Also, the 2010 population census indicates the country's ethnic diversity (over 75 ethnic groups exist). Among the various ethnic groups are Akans, Moshi-Dagbani, Ewe, Ga and Mande-Busanga. Akans are the most populous, making up 47.5 percent (Ghana Statistical Service, 2012). The least populous ethnic group is Mande-Busanga, which comprises 1.1 percent of the country's ethnic population (ibid.).

In Ghana, the various ethnic groups are contained within ten administrative regions (Gocking, 2005). While these diverse ethnic groups embody many similarities in their norms, customs and traditions, kinship norms—mostly, matrilineal and patrilineal—are often observed as providing the avenue for delineating clear ethnic differences (Nukunya, 2003). Whereas the ten regions make up the political and administrative structure of the country (Government of Ghana, 2014), matrilineal and patrilineal kinship ties are often understood to be the basis for the makeup of the Ghanaian social mores and inheritance rights (Manuh, 1997; Takyi and Gyimah, 2007).

Ghanaian intestate succession law observes kinship as an “extended group of a lineal descent of a common ancestress [matrilineal] or ancestor [patrilineal]...” for the purposes

of socialization, and distribution of wealth (Kludze, 1983. p. 60). Although bilateral kinship exists in some Ghanaian communities, for example, south Eweland of Ghana (Burns, 2009), the majority of Ghana's population recognise unilateral matrilineal or patrilineal descent system (Awusabo-Asare, 1990). As such, I focus on matrilineal and patrilineal kinship in this thesis.

Mostly, matrilineal members occupy southwestern Ghana, which is made up of Central, Ashanti, Western regions and parts of the Eastern and Brong Ahafo regions (Awusabo-Asare, 1990). In their article, "Family ties, inheritance rights and successful poverty alleviation: evidence from Ghana," Kutsoati and Morck list the various sub-ethnic groups under Akans as Asante (the largest sub-group), Akuapim, Akyem, Bono, and Fanti (Kutsoati and Morck, 2012). Crucially, matriliney can be assumed as the oldest of kinship relations in Ghana, since it is very much associated with the Akans, who are believed to be the earliest settlers in Ghana (Gocking, 2005). Traditionally, matrilineal groups, unlike their patrilineal counterparts, believe that the sustenance of the lineage is through a maternal ancestress, and thus, inheritance and succession must be traced through a maternal kin (Oppong, 2001).

Patriliney is another form of descent that exists in some Ghanaian communities. This system of descent can be understood as tracing political, cultural, social and economic rights and responsibilities exclusively from the male line because sustenance of the lineage is through a paternal ancestress. (La Ferrara, 2007). Patrilineal ethnic groups can be located in the

Greater Accra, and Volta regions as well as some parts of the Northern regions and they include Ewes, Gas, Dagomba and Nanumba (Kutsoati and Morck, 2012).

My operating hypothesis, within the context of this thesis, is that Ghanaian understandings of kinship enable a higher level of respectability and power for matrilineal women than patrilineal women, in particular, and thus, shape their experience and reporting of domestic violence. Most critically, not only does my research add to the growing but scant literature on marital violence in Ghana, it can help illuminate the gendered power dynamics that helps in enacting and perpetuating marital violence against women.

1.3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON MARITAL VIOLENCE

1.3.1 Marital violence as Violence against women

The United Nations' Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (DEVAW) defines the term: "violence against women" 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 deprivations of liberty, whether occurring in public or private life" (United Nations, 1993, A/RES/48/104). Nonetheless, the terms "violence against women" and "gender-based violence" are commonly used interchangeably to highlight most women's experience of male violence (Johnson, Ollus and Nevala, 2007). The focus on women does not erase the fact that men experience violence; rather, it is, as Terry and Hoare (2007) explain, an attempt to expose the sexed and gendered nature of societal violence.

Oftentimes, women experience violence from persons close to them, and in some cases, women retaliate with violence as a matter of self-defence (Anderson, 2005). For instance, recent studies in the United States have reported that women partners do engage in violent acts such as shoving, slapping, hitting, or throwing objects at men partners (Brush, 2005; Frieze, 2005). In a 2013 interview with a police officer, Irene Oppong, indicated that 770 men reported of having been physically beaten by their wives (Ghana News Agency, 2014). Such aforementioned studies have found little difference in prevalence for such acts by gender. However, scholars observe that oftentimes the acts perpetrated by women are often a response to male violence (Swan and Snow, 2002; Dragiewicz and DeKeseredy, 2012).

Violence against women has been viewed as a global health concern (Campbell, 2002; Campbell, Garcia-Moreno and Sharps, 2004; Coker, et al., 2002; Krantz and Garcia-Moreno, 2005; Emenike, et al., 2008). Women exposed to gender-based violence are more likely to also experience life threatening consequences such as injuries and death (Adinkra, 2008; Garcia-Moreno, et al., 2006), depression, suicidal tendencies (Ellsberg, et al., 2008; Devries, 2013), sexually transmitted infections, unwanted pregnancy, abortion and stress (Krug, Mercy, Dahlberg, and Zwi, 2002; Pallitto, Campbell, and O'Campo, 2005; Kishor, 2012). Garcia-Moreno et al. (2005) report in their *WHO multi-country study* that injury is widespread among women experiencing physical abuse, ranging from 19 percent in Ethiopia to 55 percent in Peru. Additionally, abused women are twice as likely as non-abused women to report poor health, physical and mental health problems, in the long and short term (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2005).

Violence against women threatens women's dignity, freedom, and equality in society (Bograd, 1999; Sokoloff and Dupont, 2005; McCloskey, et al., 2005; Amnesty International, 2004). Indeed, DEVAW asserts that violence against women "constitutes a violation of the rights and fundamental freedoms of women and impairs or nullifies their enjoyment of those rights and freedoms" (United Nations, 1993, A/RES/48/104). D'cruze and Rao (2005) argue that violence against women is a means through which "sexed exploitation and inequality are staged" (p.3). It is thus a means through which women's vulnerability in society is highlighted.

The knowledge that violence against women transcends cultures, nationalities, racial backgrounds, ethnicities and socio-economic statuses (see Kimmel, 2002; Jewkes, 2002; Kishor and Johnson, 2004; Andersson, et al., 2007) means that no form of violence directed at women in any part of the world can be ignored, whether it occurs in developed or developing nations. For instance, Brownridge and Halli (2001) state that violence against women is pervasive in Canadian society, despite Canada's rank as a wealthy and highly developed country (United Nations, 2011). Likewise, Simister (2010) reports that there is a high prevalence of gender-based violence in Kenya. However, because of the sensitive nature of violence against women across the globe, it remains under-reported worldwide (WHO, 2013). Notwithstanding, its prevalence indicates that globally many thousands of women are experiencing violence and battling with its consequences (Watts and Zimmerman, 2002).

Generally, acts of gender-based violence include domestic violence (also known as marital violence or intimate partner violence),¹ rape, sexual harassment during wars and conflicts (including workplaces), violent traditional practices such as female genital mutilation and forced marriages, trafficking in women and forced prostitution, sexual slavery and forced pregnancy, forced sterilization and abortion, female infanticide, forced use of contraceptives and prenatal sex selection (WHO, 2013). Of utmost concern to this thesis are intimate physical, sexual and emotional violence, along kinship lines in Ghana. I define the parameters of each of these forms of violence in the next section.

1.3.2 Marital Violence: Definition and Global Prevalence

Marital violence can be referred to as spousal violence, intimate partner violence, domestic violence, family violence, battering, and partner abuse (Andersson, et al., 2007).² Gass et al. (2012) use the term domestic violence to describe the physical, psychological, and sexual abuse, or assault of a domestic partner, or spouse. Also, Minkah-Premo (2001) refers to domestic violence as the sexed exploitation of women based on their gender roles in the domestic setting. On this basis, violence in marital relationships can be understood as a product of gender inequality and power imbalance (Jewkes, Levin and Penn-Kekana, 2003; Dunkle, et al., 2004; McCloskey, et al., 2005; Pallitto and O'Campo, 2005).

¹ Andersson, et al. (2007) uses intimate partner violence interchangeably with spousal violence, marital violence, domestic violence, family violence, battering, and partner abuse.

² Throughout this literature review, I will be using these terms interchangeably as they are used in scholarly literature to denote sexual, physical and emotional assault of a partner in the domestic or family context.

It is important to note, however, that domestic violence is not only a heterosexual issue (Blosnich and Bossarte, 2009; Ard and Makadon, 2011). Studies demonstrate that rates of intimate partner violence are similar for individuals in both homosexual and heterosexual relationships (Alexander, 2002; Burke, Jordan, & Owen, 2002; McClennen, 2005). For the purpose of this research, I concentrate on those studies that examine violence among heterosexual couples. Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that the definition of intimate partner violence varies across cultural contexts (Devries, 2013). In some communities, such as North America, the term is used in relation to violence between same- and opposite-sex ever-married and dating partners (Rennison, 2001), while in others, for example Ethiopia, it refers to violence committed against ever-married and cohabiting males and females (Garcia-Moreno, et al., 2005). In Ghanaian society, this term applies strictly to formal or informal marital unions between a man and a woman (Domestic Violence Act, 2007). Because Ghana's legislation is insufficient in criminalizing marital rape (I turn to this in detail later), this thesis adds to the growing but still scant literature that attempt to illuminate marital violence in Ghanaian context.

The World Health Organization's 2012 report, "Understanding and addressing violence against women: Intimate partner violence," discusses three most common forms of intimate partner violence among heterosexual couples across countries: physical violence; psychological or emotional violence; and sexual assault (WHO, 2012; see also Jewkes 2002). Acts of physical assault against women include slapping, kicking, beating, pulling, pushing, deliberate efforts on the part of male partners to infect a female partner with sexually transmitted disease (STDs), hitting a female partner, including the use of objects,

pouring acids and other liquids and murder. Sexual violence, meanwhile, occurs as a result of forced sexual intercourse and sexual coercion. Finally, emotional (psychological) abuse involves insults, constant humiliation, bullying and threats of harm, deprivation and isolation (WHO, 2012).

A comparative multi-country study published in the WHO report indicates that 13–61 percent of women reported ever experiencing physical violence by a partner; 4–49 percent reported having experienced severe physical violence by a domestic partner; 6–59 percent reported sexual violence by a male partner at some point in their lives; and 20–75 percent reported experiencing one psychologically abusive act, or more, from a partner in their lifetime (Garcia-Moreno, et al., 2005). Further, the WHO's progress report on intimate partner violence notes that one-third of women worldwide are at risk of experiencing physical and/or sexual coercion and rape from a male domestic partner (WHO, 2013). Finally, an analysis of Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) from 12 Latin American and Caribbean countries found that most women, 61-93 percent of respondents, who reported experiencing physical partner abuse in the past 12 months also indicated an experience with emotional or psychological violence (Bott, et al., 2012).

Despite the threat to their lives and health, many women continue to stay in abusive relationships. Reasons include: for the sake of “true love” in the hope that their male partners will change, ignorance about acts of domestic violence, concern for their children, stigma, fear of losing custody of children associated with divorce, lack of support from family and friends, and lack of alternative means of economic support (Moe, 2009).

However, according to Moe, these barriers do not prevent women from leaving abusive relationships permanently or temporarily when all hopes for a “better” relationship are exhausted (Moe, 2009). This is evidenced by Garcia-Moreno et al.’s study, which notes that 19–51 percent of women who had ever been physically abused by their partner had left home for at least one night, while 8–21 percent had left two to five times (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2005).

Globally, many structural or contextual factors are consistently cited as causing marital violence against women: women’s low social and economic status, women’s lack of civil rights, including inequitable divorce and marriage laws, weak or nonexistent legislative sanctions against domestic violence, and sociocultural acceptance of violence as a way to resolve spousal conflicts (WHO, 2010). All of these indicate systemic social indifference and bias embedded in women’s social relations with men (MacKinnon, 2006). Notwithstanding this data, Vandello and Cohen (2003) point out in their article, “Male honor and female fidelity: implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence” that violence is specific to cultures and its correlation with domestic settings varies with social contexts. For instance, the use of violence on the part of men to stamp supremacy may be condoned and endorsed in some cultures but not others (Vandello and Cohen, 2003).

1.3.3 Marital Violence: Prevalence in sub-Saharan Africa

Compared to countries in other parts of the world, marital violence is widespread and incidents of female partner abuse are high in countries in the sub-Saharan African region (McCloskey, et al., 2005). For instance, a comparative analysis published in 2013 of 141

studies in 81 countries shows that partner assault is highest for women in sub-Saharan Africa, where a proportion of 66 percent of women have been subjected at some point in their lives to physical and sexual assault (WHO, 2013). Using Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) data from nine countries around the world, Kishor and Johnson (2004) indicate that the percentage of ever-partnered women subject to violence was highest in Zambia, where 48 percent was recorded for physical violence, and 17 percent was noted for sexual violence. A 2002 South African survey found that 40 percent of females between the ages of 13–23 were at risk of experiencing intimate partner violence (Swart et al., 2002). Last, but not the least, Obi and Ozumba (2007) report that 78.8 percent of Nigerian women are at risk of experiencing domestic violence in Igbo communities in southern Nigeria.

The most common explanations relating to the pervasiveness of marital violence in the African sub-region include the strong presence of patriarchy on the one hand (Dolan, 2001), and high poverty levels on the other hand (Amoakohene, 2004). More specifically, women's marital experiences in sub-Sahara Africa are shaped by social expectations of subordination to men, where it is expected that males dominate and control in order to assert manhood (Ampofo, 1993; Ofei-Aboagye, 1994). In the end, the link between marital violence, patriarchy and poverty is circular (Simister, 2010): the internal workings of patriarchy include the sexist measures that disadvantage women and render them vulnerable in political, cultural, social and economic realms. This perspective is also shared by feminist scholars such as Price (2005), Bennet (2006), and Hunnicut (2009), to mention but few.

That said, it is also important to acknowledge that African societies are deeply heterogeneous (Linos, et al., 2013) and this applies to Ghanaian society, too. In view of this, norms differ across cultures, both within and across nation-states. In Ghana, women's social, economic and political positions differ along kinship lines (Oppong, 2001). It is therefore important to focus the lens further on Ghanaian society's relationship to intimate partner violence, with regards to the norms that prevail along matrilineal and patrilineal kinship lines. Using the GDHS data, the purpose of this project is to examine the issue of violence against married Ghanaian women from feminist scholars' standpoint.

1.3.4 Marital violence: The Ghanaian Case

The rates of marital violence in Ghana are similar to those of other sub-Saharan African countries. For instance, a 1998 survey showed that 72 percent of women in Ghana had ever experienced domestic and marital violence, with three in ten Ghanaian women admitting to having been forced to have sex by their male partner (Coker-Appiah and Cusack, 1999). Moreover, domestic violence cases seem to be increasing over the years. For example, the Women and Juvenile Unit (WAJU) of Ghana Police Service reported 360 cases of wife beating in 1999; 385 in 2000; 648 in 2001; and 3622 in 2002 (Amoakohene, 2004). In 2010, the Domestic Violence and Victims Support Unit reported 109,784 cases of domestic violence (Ghana News Agency, 2010). It is possible that the increase in the incidence and prevalence of domestic and marital violence is a response both to the increasing awareness about the problem in Ghanaian societies, and to the establishment of WAJU (Women and Juvenile Unit) in 1998 (Ghana Police Service, 2008).

In spite of the alarming rates of intimate partner violence in Ghana, Ardayfio (2005) and Amankwa (2008) have lamented the conspicuous lack of research on partner violence in Ghana. The scant literature, both quantitative and qualitative research, on marital violence reveals that three most common forms are prevalent in Ghana: physical assault, emotional (psychological), and sexual violence. Physical female partner abuse is reported at a rate of 18.4 percent, compared to a 5.1 percent rate of sexual abuse of domestic female partners (Tenkorang, et al., 2013). As for emotional violence, about 27 percent of ever-married women are reported to have experienced it, including threats, insults, and destruction of property at a point in their intimate relationships (Coker-Appiah and Cusack, 1999).

At a legal level, intimate partner violence in Ghana is understood through the Domestic Violence Act, which was passed into law on February 22, 2007. The Act defines the parameters of domestic violence and these are relatively consistent with those of the World Health Organization, which I have explored earlier in the thesis. Also, the Domestic Violence Act prohibits domestic violence and provides protection for victims of domestic and marital violence. In addition to this, it provides procedures for the arrest of perpetrators (see Domestic Violence Act, 2007). Although the Act has been praised as an important initial step towards addressing gender-based violence in Ghana, lawmakers specifically exempted the portion on marital rape that would repeal Ghana's Criminal Code, 1960, Act 29 (Manuh, 2007). This exemption from the initial bill is on the grounds that criminalizing forced sexual encounter within marriage conflicts with Ghanaian traditions (Stafford, 2008). The provisions in Ghana's Criminal Code, 1960, Act 29, meanwhile, accept marital rape on account of the supposed consent given upon marriage (Manuh, 2007). To

seek redress to issues of marital rape in the domestic context, Ghanaian ever-married women have a special obligation to prove the revocation of consent to marriage (Achampong and Sampson, 2010; Ampofo, 2008). This deficiency in the Domestic Violence Act (DVA), therefore, limits women's ability to hold husbands accountable in cases of forceful sex in the private sphere and deprives married women of an effective legal redress (ibid.).

But domestic violence in the Ghanaian context is shaped not only by legal frameworks. As is the case in most African cultures, gender roles are clearly defined in Ghana, and traditional norms and beliefs support them (Ardayfio, 2005). Male domination and control is highly prized and is maintained and exercised through, for example, female abuse (Koenig et al., 2003; Uthman, et al., 2009; Dunkle, et al., 2004). This is confirmed by Tenkorang et al. who report a strong positive relationship between male domination and intimate partner violence against married women in Ghana: they note that a husband's domineering attitude towards his wife's activities is a strong predictor for both physical and sexual violence. This factor was found to be independent of other variables such as women's wealth and education. In the same vein, Ghanaian women who consider their husband's violence towards them as a demonstration of love and affection are more likely to experience male violence (Tenkorang et al., 2013).

Furthermore, the incidences of marital violence against Ghanaian women are embodied in cultural practices such as the performance of marriage rites, which enact and perpetuate the vulnerability of women to marital violence (Osam, 2004). Amobi Linus Ilika (2006), for

example, notes that the total submission or subordination of women to men in marital relationships, in most sub-Saharan African cultures, is enforced during the performance of marriage rituals or rites.

According to cultural notions about marriage, a woman's "honour" is paid through marriage. This "honour" is signified by the payment of a bride price, on the woman's "head" by the prospective husband. Married women are compelled to maintain their "honour" by staying married even when violated (Ilika, 2006). According to Minka-Premo (2001), bride price related expenses demanded from the prospective husband—which include "head drinks," jewels, money and so on—are attempts to "package" the woman as a "good" and "obedient" wife, whom a prospective husband has come to "take away" from a respectable and protective father and brother(s). I suggest that the performance of marriage rituals emphasizes male entitlement, power, and superiority, compared to female submission and powerlessness, and domesticity; thus, the place of female marital abuse can be noted when there is a transgression of the female subordinate role. Moreover, scholars have observed that the feeling on the part of men that they have "owned" a "wife" through the payment of a "fat" bride price is central to male violence in marriage (Kaye, et al., 2005).

Rosemary King (2006) observes another important aspect of women's socialization in Ghanaian societies. Folklore, in the form of storytelling (for example, Kwaku Ananse³), imparts moral lessons which socialize individuals to accept and justify male control and abuse. Kwaku Ananse stories are told orally and interspersed with traditional songs to

³ Kwaku Ananse stories, or Anansesem, or spider stories originate from the Akan tradition (Ofori, 2010) and now they are told across ethnic groups in Ghana to depict their own traditions and culture.

convey life lessons, or principles, and humour. Anansesem is a way of passing on cultural traditions and customs from one generation to another. More significantly, story time brings members of the extended family or the household together to reinforce sense of community (Ofori, 2010). But King (2006) locates the exercise of male authority as implicit in the meanings of most Kwaku Ananse stories and claims that such stories socialize people into internalizing and accepting sexism. As native folklore, for example Kwaku Ananse stories, are often narrated to young males and females, they serve a pedagogical function and serve to internalize strict gender norms into the Ghanaian public and their socialization.

On the socialization of women in Ghana, Karim (2011) has averred that women are made to believe that violence in marital relationships is a private matter between couples, and female partner abuse is “hidden” by both the male perpetrator and female victim. Because victims could be a potential source of social ridicule for their families and relatives just for reporting their husband to the police, many women are deterred by their families from reporting abuse. That is to say, the fear of social stigmatization, together with continuous blaming of women for marital abuse, means that many cases could go unreported.

As well, Cantalupo and others observe that the socialization of Ghanaian women involves a constellation of several factors, including socio-cultural norms, which constitute the socialisation of women into a mainstream acceptance of self, as inferior. This kind of women’s socialization is different from that of male socialization. Women are socialized to recognize and exhibit normative feminine traits such as passivity and submission as well as

to be available to gratify male sexual, physical and psychological needs, whereas it is expected that men exhibit normative masculinity such as aggression and domination, and the exercise of sexual “right” (Cantalupo et al., 2006). Often, traditional norms recognize men as domestic heads and breadwinners, and women as procreators and domestic caretakers (Karim, 2011). On average, Ghanaian women view domestic violence against them as an outcome of female transgression of the status quo (Ofei-Aboagye, 1994; Ampofo, 2001).

Ethnicity is an important area of study in relation to intimate partner violence in Ghana. Tenkorang and Owusu (2013) note that partner violence differs along ethnic lines in Ghana: Ewe and Ga-Adangbe women are at a higher risk of experiencing a coercive first sexual encounter, compared to women belonging to the Akan ethnic group. Susanna Osam suggests that specific sociocultural practices such as *trokosi* (wife slavery) help to perpetuate female domestic abuse and these practices are more common among certain ethnic groups, such as Ewes, than Akans (Osam, 2004; see also Ababio, 2000). In the practice of *trokosi*, a female, usually a virgin, is selected to atone for crimes committed by other members of the family (Ameh, 2001).

In addition to ethno-cultural norms, other contextual, or societal factors are also known to perpetuate female partner subordination and subsequent abuse in a Ghanaian context. Women’s economic vulnerability and lack of education work together to perpetuate violence among heterosexual couples in the domestic setting (Boateng, 2012). Thus, for example, Stephen Adjei Baffour (2012) observes a link between income level, educational

level and domestic violence among low income women in Ghana. This link is evidenced by the Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (2008), which indicates that women with low economic statuses and low educational levels are by far in the highest risk group for male partner violence in Ghana (Mann and Takyi, 2009). According to Baffour (2012), women's low economic status increases their vulnerability to their male counterparts, who, in most cases are more economically empowered; thus in a cycle of events, a lack of alternative means of economic support often keeps Ghanaian women in violent marriages, even at great risk to their lives (Baffour, 2012).

Nonetheless, La Ferrara (2007) maintains that the descent rules for inheritance enshrined within Ghanaian kinship norms give some women more economic leverage than others, for example, in relation to their right to share farmlands and properties with their kinsmen (2007). This is evident in matrilineal societies. Women's economic situation is highlighted by Christina Oppong who writes,

the comparatively independent social and economic position of Akan women is a striking feature in Ghanaian society...they owe this [to their right] to control property through farming and trading, as well as to the social and economic support of their matrikin, who protect their right, and with whom they share the use of the lineage lands and houses. (Oppong, 2001, p.212).

While such studies on kinship are useful, they do not appreciate how matrilineal and patrilineal norms may influence Ghanaian women's experience of male intimate partner violence. This thesis aims to fill this void in literature.

To close this chapter, I want to emphasize that the Ghanaian concept of kinship is central to my thesis. As previously mentioned, Ghanaian socialization often confers on women and men either matrilineal or patrilineal inheritance rights. In matrilineal communities, it is possible that the economic, political, and social power that is conferred on women belonging to this group serves as a "check" against male-domination and its subsequent outcome: violence. Given the power dynamics of women's kinship relationships in Ghana, as Awusabo-Asare (1990), Oppong (2001), and La Ferrara (2007) have noted, it is thus important to consider kinship as a category of analysis in relation to intimate partner violence or marital violence. To my knowledge, this study is the first of its kind that employs quantitative methods to examine the interaction between kinship and marital violence. In the following chapter, I examine the methodology that underpins this research study.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

2.0 METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I situate my research within feminist approaches to methodology. I describe my project's methodological underpinnings, including the reflexive stance that I undertake, and I introduce my research methods. Situating my work within feminist scholarship helps to be politically accountable (Ackerly and True, 2008) throughout my writing of this quantitative project. Political accountability in this research process requires me to be reflexive; that is, my choice of research topic, theoretical foundations, and method, as well as to the conclusions, implications and limitations of this study.

Feminist scholarship has been described as openly personal, and political, and an “exciting terrain” (Hesse-Biber, 2004, p.3). Critically, approaches to feminist scholarship are outcomes of criticisms of mainstream approaches that have often resulted in silencing and excluding the experiences of non-dominant groups such as women (Campbell and Wasco, 2000). While much feminist scholarship is empirical, it tends to exhibit direct aversion to traditional positivism (Doucet and Mauthner (2006). Feminist scholarly critiques about traditional epistemology and methodology are varied (ibid.) and I have outlined these criticisms in the following sections. Meanwhile, regardless of the heterogeneity of these critiques, most conclude that traditional mainstream approaches to research have been male dominated and exclusionary to women's experiences (Campbell and Wasco, 2000). This point serves as a point of departure for setting up this chapter.

2.1 EPISTEMOLOGICAL TENETS OF FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP

An epistemological framework refers to a system of thought about knowledge production; that is, it is concerned with questions such as the nature and scope of knowledge (Creswell, 2012; Duran, 2001; Alcoff, Alcoff and Potter, 2013). Feminist epistemology has been particularly interested in the ways social issues influence knowledge production processes through, for example, research (Lykke, 2010).

Feminist epistemology is steered by the recognition that research is influenced by social assumptions about gender difference, in addition to other issues of race, ethnicity and class, among others (Jiang, 2005). On this basis, feminist scholars reject positivist claims to value-free knowledge-building independent of researcher social biases and assumptions; rather, feminist scholars embrace the knowledge-building process from a value-laden standpoint (Jiang, 2005; Campbell and Wasco, 2000; Risman, 2001). For feminist scholars and researchers, a value-laden stance towards knowledge production process is explicitly consistent with feminism's political commitment to make visible issues of marginalization and domination inherent in gender relations and other sites of inequality. Feminist research and scholarship can therefore be located within what Harmais (2013) refers to as a "postpositivist" era.

Additionally, according to some feminist scholars, traditional scholarly approaches and positivist research have been male-biased. By this, they mean that the epistemic standards that govern conventional approaches to research have largely overlooked women's experience and perspectives (Hesse-Biber, 2007). Prevailing norms of male superiority

have resulted in overestimation of men's experiences over women's experience, in the process situating male knowledge as universal and true for all (Hesse-Biber and Carter, 2000). Feminist scholars, therefore, often critique outcomes from conventional research processes on the basis that they represent a one-sided view of the world, and further, that this view is then generalized as universal (Harding and Norberg, 2005).

Instead, feminist scholars point to the epistemic relevance of producing knowledge from the position of oppressed groups such as women (Harding, 2004). Feminist scholars employing a standpoint methodology, for example, believe that women as a minority group occupy a unique epistemic standpoint from which to view and understand the social realm (Wickramasingh, 2010). Women's experience has, therefore, been understood as central to the project of feminist research and scholarship; and, feminist researchers believe that making women's experience a centrality of feminist research is an attempt to view the world from the lens of women's perspectives (Jaggar, 2008).

Because minority or oppressed groups view the world through the eyes of dominant groups in addition to their own (what scholars have termed a double consciousness), capturing the experiences of oppressed groups can help to challenge mainstream knowledge (Wickramasingh, 2010). Moreover, the perspectives of members of oppressed groups can enable a better understanding of the social realm; indeed, some scholars assert that the voices and stories of oppressed and marginalized groups are more epistemically viable than those of dominant groups (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2007). In other words, and

in relation to my own work, women's oppressed social position places them at a relevant epistemic level as better *knowers* precisely because they have the ability to expose the internal workings of social domination, and ways of negotiating and overcoming societal abuse and marginalization.

More recently, feminist scholars have integrated intersectional lenses into their research frameworks. Epistemologically, intersectionality sets standards for capturing diverse women's experiences holistically, because it seeks to integrate questions of gender with other social and political markers of identity, including ethnicity, class, education (Harding, 2004), and kinship. Sandra Harding (2004) further argues that these distinctive experiences provide an all-inclusive and heterogeneous understanding and support of society. Harding's argument is corroborated by Ramazanoglu and Holland (2002), who state that intersectional approach to research rejects homogenization of categories, rather encourages a consideration of independent experiences within groups. An epistemic appreciation of intersectionality, therefore, helps to recognize difference and interactions between specific social locations and women's circumstances.

Finally, it is worth noting that some feminist scholars have been leery of quantitative data collection methods, which often postulate gender as a stable category, rather than as a dynamic social construct (Harnois, 2013). Scholars such as Zuberi (2001), and Pager and Sheperd (2008) go further in stating that traditional knowledge building practices overlook the real depth of the dynamics of racial and ethnic differences, for instance, the

homogenization of racial groups while ignoring individual access to privilege (ibid.). Furthermore, the adoption of traditional methods can result in universalizing gender experiences (Hesse-Biber, 2004). As a consequence, traditional knowledge production strategies can overlook real issues of societal differences, and the outcomes of these differences in producing and reproducing social and gender injustices (ibid.). Because capturing women's lived experiences has been central to feminist scholarship, feminist scholars suggest the adoption of research practices such as qualitative methods that can allow an in-depth exploration of research topics; such research practices accommodate intimately personal and open engagement with research questions (Campbell and Wasco, 2000).

However, given that there is no single distinctive feminist method of research (Harnois, 2013), Catherine Harnois attaches an equal importance to survey research because of its ability to generate concrete data that exposes the existence and extent of a social problem in order to discredit traditional assumptions (2013, p.1). Harnois goes further in stating that "the research design and tools of data collection and analysis should be chosen on the basis that they are the most appropriate to answering a given research question" (2013, p.3). With this, a personal communication with Dr. Eric Yeboah Tenkorang, my co-supervisor for this research helped to come up with relevant quantitative data for this research, that is, 2008 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey. Despite some feminist scholars' criticisms about quantitative data and methods, this data helps to address my research questions. While I will discuss this data in detail in the "method" section, it is noteworthy to move on to explain feminist method(ology) at this juncture.

2.2 METHODOLOGICAL TENETS OF FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP

Informed by the aforementioned epistemological tenets, feminist methodological framework involves a “commitment to using a whole constellation of methods [in a research] reflectively and critically, with the end aim being the production of data that serve feminist aims of social justice” (Arkerly and True, 2010, p.6). Feminist methodology, therefore, encompasses research practices that interrogate the production and reproduction of power imbalances, opens up discussions about gender bias and other varied forms of inequality, and advocates for equity (Letherby, 2003; Hesse-Biber, 2004; Harding and Norberg, 2005). In this research project I have been critical of my research practices by engaging feminist reflexive stances.

2.2.1 Feminist reflexivity

The aims of feminist scholarship are facilitated by reflexive practices, especially in research processes. This practice of self-reflexivity in the research process can be seen as an attempt to avoid enacting and perpetuating the ways in which power imbalances express themselves in knowledge production processes (Atkinson, Delamont, Coffey, Lofland, and Lofland, 2007). Feminist reflexivity can be understood as a feminist methodological act. It involves self-reflection and self-assessment of research procedures (Antonacopoulou and Tsoukas, 2002). Scholars such as Mauthner and Doucet (2003), Archer (2004), Nicholls (2009), and Carroll (2009), note that reflexivity can help researchers to closely examine their own influence on the research process. Thus, reflexivity helps the researcher to interrogate her role in the research process. This critical self-reflection includes such things

as researcher's influence on the study and social positioning such as class, sexuality, race, ethnicity and kinship. A reflexive approach also allows for a close interrogation of chosen methods for the research (Fonow and Cook, 2005). Furthermore, reflexivity is an ongoing process that helps bring attention to the researcher's emotions, biases, and assumptions about the research (Shope, 2006). Because reflexivity helps the researcher to acknowledge preconceived assumptions and biases about the research process (Deutsch, 2004; Ramazanoglu and Holland, 2002), Nancy Deutsch (2004) says that it enables the researcher to be accountable to the analysis and the interpretation she makes of the research data.

Undertaking this research project has been a process of self-discovery for me. Prior to my engagement with this research process, I had been opposed to claiming a feminist identity. This is because I had taken on the idea that feminists were "manhaters," and I did not want to be seen as one. More troubling, it seemed that no matter how hard I tried to avoid it, most people I met identified me as a feminist. For instance, my strong resistance to sexist attitudes and norms meant that people saw me as feminist. Indeed, most of my peers concluded that my enrolment into a Master of Gender Studies program automatically made me a feminist.

No matter how peers or others identify me, I have embarked on this journey of researching about women's experiences of marital violence in Ghana because I am convinced that no one deserves violence on the basis of their gender. The fact that gender inequality (male-domination versus female subordination) is central to the cause of domestic and marital violence (Price, 2005) means that I, too, as a woman, could fall victim to it; and examining

the issue of marital violence against Ghanaian women thus serves as a lens through which to examine my own potential vulnerabilities. Finally, understanding my vulnerability through this research serves as a basis for enacting change against intimate partner violence within my own professional and personal circles.

My reflection during this research process has also resulted in my questioning of my self-claimed pan-Africanist⁴ identity. Pan-Africanism acknowledges that individuals of Black descent are discriminated against through racism, and that their culture is often stereotyped (Shivji, 2008). In this view, self-identified pan-Africanists engage in actions and inactions in order to avoid further stereotyping. Throughout this research, I try to privilege some aspects of African and Ghanaian culture; and, further, I framed this research in such a way as to examine the diversity of Ghanaian culture. That is, I am interested in the ways in which cultural norms express agency (to some extent) on the part of some women and not others on the basis of ethnic and kinship difference. At the same time, examining the extent of male-domination and female subordination and, its relationship with marital violence among Ghanaian ethnic and kinship groups is central to this research.

My ethnic identity also motivates and underpins this research project. I am originally from a patrilineal ethnic group, but I grew up in a matrilineal community. As I explained in my introduction, if I use the word matrilineal and patrilineal in the Ghanaian context, I mean to say that as a member of a patrilineal ethnic group, I am socialized to share responsibilities and privileges with my paternal relatives. The opposite is true for those belonging to the

⁴ Pan-Africanism is a movement that creates a political platform for people of African descent in relation to their shared experiences of discrimination and stereotyping (Shivji, 2008).

matrilineal societies. Again, as a gendered woman in the patrilineal group, I am not privileged by customs to take part in decision making in my traditional community. But women belonging to the matrilineal group are privileged traditionally to take part in decision-making, including sharing properties and lands with their kinsmen. Moreover, in matrilineal societies, political, economic and social rights are tracked down from a maternal line. My experiences in both patrilineal and matrilineal societies, as a female gendered as woman, influence my framing of this research study.

Last but not the least, my clinical experiences as a registered nurse add further weight to my decision to frame this project around the topic of domestic violence. Before my clinical work, I had never heard anyone talk about family abuse, and I have never experienced or witnessed any violence within the home. During my clinical practice at Korle-Bu Teaching Hospital (the largest teaching hospital in Ghana), I was stationed in the female Orthopaedic Ward. Here, I attended to females who reported with such concerns as deep lacerations, broken bones, injury to vital organs such as the eyes, but to name few. In all of this, I realised that women from the Akan ethnic group appeared to report less male violence.

Epistemologically, I do not make claims for value-free outcome of this research, because the ways I frame my analysis and discussion of the data in relation to Ghanaian women's experiences of marital violence is influenced by my identities as a feminist, pan-Africanist, a

middle-class Ghanaian, and a cisgender female.⁵ Also, my analyses are influenced by my professional experiences as a nurse. These identities and experiences frame my values. In relative terms, because women's experiences of marital violence are central to this research, I claim that the end product of this research is epistemologically viable.

Using data drawn from the Ghana Demographic and Health Survey, I write about Ghanaian women's experiences of marital violence in the context of their relations with their kinsmen. By writing about Ghanaian women's experiences of marital violence in this research, I engage in a relationship with those I write about and this relationship is imbued with power, as Harding and Norberg (2005) suggest. Consistent with the aims of feminist scholarship, I use this agency to "directly advance social justice" (ibid. p. 2012). Because laws on domestic violence (DV ACT 732) in Ghana do not prohibit marital rape (Achampong and Sampson, 2010), this research could be a useful tool for law and policy makers in terms of appreciating the questions of power that is central to male violence and hence, the urgent need to empower women, for example through the law.

2.2.1 Methods

While my professional experiences and social positioning have played a large role in framing the research topic, research questions, analysis and discussion, I have also drawn on a secondary data source. In this feminist-framed research, data comes from the 2008 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS).

⁵ Cisgender is used to describe persons whose bodies and personal identities matches with their assigned gender at birth (Schilt, K. and Westbrook, 2009).

Data and Sampling

The Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS) is a nationally representative dataset, organized by the Ghana Statistical Service (GSS), and the Ghana Health Service (GHS), including the Ghana AIDS Commission. The GDHS is part of the Global Demographic and Health Surveys Program (DHS), and it receives support from international organizations such as Macro International who provide assistance to developing countries such as Ghana to monitor the health and population of the citizenry.

First conducted in 1988, the GDHS occurs every five years, with the most recent one conducted in 2008. From the outset of GDHS in 1988, it continues to provide detailed and reliable data on household characteristics, education, maternal health and child health, nutrition, family planning, gender, and knowledge and behaviour related to HIV/AIDS. Information on domestic violence is a recent addition to GDHS, in 2008. Finally, the GDHS data is important in providing relevant information for stakeholders and governmental agencies for national level planning purposes (GSS, 2009).

As a national survey, the GDHS is household-based with a nationwide probability sample of more than 12,000 households. This selection includes all the ten distinctive regions in Ghana (GSS, 2009). The 2008 GDHS used a two-stage sample design. In the first stage, the GDHS used the 2000 population and housing census as a master sampling frame. The GDHS selected a total of 412 clusters from this master frame.

The second stage involved the systematic sampling of 30 of the households listed in each sampling point or cluster. The GDHS's primary objectives of the second stage of selection

were to ensure adequate numbers of completed individual interviews to provide estimates for key indicators with acceptable precision (GSS, 2009). Data could not be collected in one of the selected clusters due to unspecified security reasons, resulting in a final sample of 12,323 selected households (GSS, 2009). For the domestic violence module, a total of 1835 ever-married heterosexual women aged 15-49 years answered questions on physical, sexual and emotional domestic violence (GSS, 2009); thus, the sample for this study is limited to 1835 women aged 15-49 years who answered questions on domestic violence.

2.2.1.ii Questionnaires

Each household selected was eligible for an interview with the household questionnaire. The household questionnaire was then used to identify women and men who were eligible for the individual interview (GSS, 2009). Three questionnaires were used for the 2008 GDHS: the Household Questionnaire, the Women's Questionnaire and the Men's Questionnaire. The content of these questionnaires was based on model questionnaires developed by the DHS programme and the 2003 GDHS Questionnaires (GSS, 2009). The 2008 GDHS questionnaires reflect relevant issues in population, family planning, HIV/AIDS, malaria, other health-related issues and domestic violence in Ghana (GSS, 2009). The GDHS team translated questionnaires from English into three major local languages, namely Akan, Ga, and Ewe, and pre-tested the questionnaires two months before the study (GSS, 2009). The final construction of the survey instruments and logistical arrangements is based on lessons learnt from the pre-test (GSS, 2009).

The household questionnaire requires some basic information such as age, sex, education, and relationship to the head of the household (asset ownership at the household level). It requires participants to list all the usual members and visitors (who had at least spent a night) in the selected households. It also collects information on characteristics of the household's dwelling unit, such as the source of water, type of toilet facilities, materials used for the floor and roof of the house, ownership of various durable goods, and ownership and use of mosquito nets (GSS, 2009).

The Women's Questionnaire collected information from all women aged 15-49 in half of selected households. This questionnaire asks questions about women respondents and their children born in the five years previous to the survey. Topics include: education, residential history, media exposure, reproductive history, knowledge and use of family planning methods, fertility preferences, antenatal and delivery care, breastfeeding and infant and young child feeding practices, vaccinations and childhood illnesses, marriage and sexual activity, woman's work and husband's background characteristics, childhood mortality, awareness and behaviour about AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs), awareness of TB and other health issues, exposure to malaria during their most recent pregnancy in the five years preceding the survey and the treatment for malaria, and domestic violence (GSS, 2009).

The Men's Questionnaire gathered information from all men aged 15-49 living in half of the selected households in the GDHS sample. The Men's Questionnaire collected much of the same information found in the Women's Questionnaire, but was shorter because it did not

contain questions about reproductive history, maternal and child health or nutrition (GSS, 2009). However, the Men's Questionnaire *did* collect information on men's experience of domestic violence.

In all, GDHS teams interviewed a total of 11,778 households. In half of the households selected for the survey, interviews with respondents included 4,916 women aged 15- 49 and 4,568 men aged 15-49. Data collection took place over a three-month period, from early September to late November 2008 (GSS, 2009). For the purpose of my research, I consider ever-married women's experiences of male partner violence. This means that I focused most intently on the Women's Questionnaire.

2.2.1.iii Domestic violence module and GDHS

Questions on domestic violence are very recent additions to the GDHS questionnaire. While this aspect of the GDHS provides data for this research, this factor alone makes an interesting grounds for study. The domestic violence module of the GDHS addresses ever-married women's experience of interpersonal violence, including acts of physical, sexual, and emotional violence. "Ever-married women" - women who have ever been in a legally or customarily recognised domestic relationship in Ghana - who reported ever experiencing any emotional, physical or sexual violence by their current or most recent male partner, were asked to respond to questions about incidents of domestic violence in the 12 month period preceding the survey.

The interview questions include: Does your husband or partner ever “*slap you?*”; “*twist your arm or pull your hair?*”; “*push you, shake you, or throw something at you?*”; “*punch you with his fist or something that could hurt you?*”; “*kick you, drag you, or beat you up?*”; “*try to choke you, or burn you on purpose?*”; “*threaten or attack you with a knife, gun, or any other weapon?*”; “*physically force you to have sex with him even when you did not want to?*”; “*force you to perform any sexual acts you did not want to?*” Respondents answered “yes” to these questions if they had experienced any of these acts of violence; otherwise, they answered “no” (GSS, 2009, p. 300, italics in original).

The GDHS is also a very important source for questions related to women’s sexuality and empowerment, as well as to questions that concern women’s abilities to make important life-choices and decisions. Questions that touch on these topics tap into women’s decision-making skills, their control over their immediate environment and their attitudes towards gender roles, all of which are important for examining Ghanaian women’s conceptions about the patriarchy (GSS, 2009). Thus, women were asked about their role in household decision-making and their acceptance of wife-beating. They were also asked to give their opinions about whether they could deny their husbands sex (GSS, 2009).

2.2.1.iv *Ethical Considerations*

Because questioning women's past experiences of domestic violence could end up re-traumatizing the research participants, the GDHS built specific protections into the questionnaire. These protections draw on the World Health Organization's ethical and safety recommendations on data collection from victims of domestic violence (see WHO, 2001). The recommendations include the following. First, the DHS protocol specifies that the DV module could only be administered to one randomly selected female per household. Therefore, in households with more than one eligible woman, the respondent for the module was randomly selected through a specially designed simple selection procedure (based on the "Kish Grid"⁶) which was built into the Household Questionnaire (GSS, 2009). Interviewing only one person in each household using the domestic violence module provides assurance to the selected respondent that other respondents in the household will not talk about the types of questions the selected respondent was asked (GSS, 2009). However, this method also runs the risk of excluding possibly vital responses.

Second, the respondents gave informed consent at the beginning of interview. At the beginning of the domestic violence section, the GDHS interviewer read an additional statement informing the interviewee that the subsequent questions could be sensitive, and reassuring them of the confidentiality of their responses (GSS, 2009).

Third, the GDHS team administered the domestic violence module only if complete privacy could be obtained. If privacy could not be obtained, the interviewer was respectfully

⁶Kish grid is a method for selecting members within a household to be interviewed. It uses a pre-assigned table of random numbers to find the person to be interviewed (Gaziano, 2005).

instructed to skip the module. If a translator was needed to conduct the interview, respondents were not asked questions from the domestic violence module in order to maintain privacy (GSS, 2009).

Complete privacy is also essential for ensuring the security of the respondent and the interviewer. Asking about or reporting violence, especially in households where the perpetrator may be present at the time of interview, carries the risk of further violence (GSS, 2009). Accordingly, interviewers were provided with specific training for implementing the domestic violence module to enable the field staff to collect domestic violence data in a secure, confidential, and ethical manner (GSS, 2009).

Given that only one person was administered the domestic violence module in each selected household, that this person was randomly chosen, and the domestic violence module was not administered if privacy could not be obtained, 17 of the 2,563 women eligible for the domestic violence module had to be excluded because of lack of privacy. A further 23 women refused to be interviewed with the domestic violence module, resulting in 1835 ever-married women who answered questions on domestic violence.

2.2.1.v Measures

In this research, I employ three major dependent variables that capture different dimensions of domestic violence against married women: *physical violence*, *sexual violence* and *emotional violence*. I outlined the parameters for these variables in the introduction.

I created a scale measure for physical violence from a series of questions that asked respondents if: *“husband ever pushed shook or threw something at them”; “if husband ever slapped them”; “if husband ever kicked or dragged respondents; ever tried to strangle or burn respondents”; “if husband ever threatened or attacked with knife or gun and if husbands ever twisted respondents’ arms or pull their hair”* (GSS, 2009, p. 300, italics in original).

For sexual violence I created a scale from two questions that asked women if their *“husbands ever physically forced sex when not wanted and if husbands ever forced any other sexual acts when not wanted”* (GSS, 2009, p. 300, italics in original).

Finally, I created a scale measure for emotional violence from three questions that asked women if their *“husbands had humiliated them, had threatened them with any harm and had insulted or made them feel bad”* (GSS, 2009, p. italics in original). These questions reveal emotional violence in that they expose women’s psychological victimization.

Response categories for all variables are dichotomous (Yes=1 and No=0) and I used Principal Component Analysis (PCA)⁷ to create all scales. Reliability coefficients⁸ for physical, sexual and emotional violence scales are 0.775, 0.640 and 0.653 respectively. Positive values on these scales indicate higher physical, sexual and emotional violence, while negative values represent lower physical, sexual and emotional violence respectively.

⁷ Principal Component Analysis (PCA) is a tool for data analysis, used to identify patterns in data and expressing the data in a form that highlights similarities and differences in the data (Jolliffe, 2002).

⁸Reliability Coefficients: this describes the overall consistency of a measure and it exists in types. In this study, this measure was determined by using Cronbach’s Alpha formula (Fox, 1997).

I also examined explanatory or independent variables. Such variables are relevant to feminist theories of domestic and marital violence which seek to explain domestic violence against women in the context of gendered relations. I examined socioeconomic and sociocultural variables to capture different degrees of vulnerabilities of women to male partner violence, and these are relevant to intersectional theories. Thus, socio-economic variables include such factors as educational background, employment status and wealth status. I coded educational background as follows: no education=0, primary education=1, secondary education=2 and higher education=3. Similarly, I coded the employment status of respondents to include the following: not employed=0; employed=1. I coded wealth status to reflect a composite index based on the household's ownership of a number of consumer items including television and a car, flooring material, drinking water, toilet facilities etc. coded (poorest=0; poorer=1; middle=2; richer=3; richest=4).

Socio-cultural variables include questions on “wife beating” and “husband’s control and domineering attitudes” (GDHS, 2008, p.320). The former is an index I created from questions that asked women if they consider wife-beating justified: “if they go out without telling their husbands, neglects the children, argue with their husbands, refuses to have sex with their husbands, and burns the food” (GDHS, 2008, p.320). I obtain the latent construct—justification for wife-beating (a scale measure)—using Principal Component Analysis. Here, the reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s Alpha) for this scale is 0.813. Positive values on the scale indicate higher levels of justification for wife-beating, while negative values indicate otherwise.

For the variable “husband’s control or domineering attitudes” I created a scale measure using PCA from variables that asked women if their “husbands get jealous on seeing them talk with other men, husband accuses respondents of unfaithfulness, husband does not permit wife to meet her girlfriends, husband tries to limit respondent’s contact with family, husband insists on knowing where respondent is, husband doesn’t trust respondent with money, refuses or denies sex with the respondent” (GSS, 2009, p. 310). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s Alpha) is 0.690. Positive values on the scale indicate higher levels of control by husbands of respondents, while negative values indicate lower levels of control. I also introduced two variables in order to capture married women’s past experiences of violence in their families. These include family histories of violence and spousal alcohol consumption. I coded “respondent’s father ever beat her mother” as no=0, yes=1, don’t know=2, and I coded the respondent’s “husband’s alcohol drinking behaviour” as no=0, yes=1 (GSS, 2009, p. 318).

Finally, I introduced religion, residence (rural/urban), region and age as control variables. I coded women’s religion as follows: Christian=0; Muslim=1; Traditional=2; No religion=3). Then, I coded residence as follows: rural/urban residence (urban=0; rural=1), and I coded region of residence as Greater Accra=0; Central=1; Western=2; Volta=3; Eastern=4; Ashanti=5; Brong Ahafo=6; Northern=7; Upper East=8; Upper West=9.

2.2.1.vi *Analytical Technique*

Given that the dependent variables are continuous (that is, a set of integers), I employ the Ordinary Least Squares regression technique. My analyses were preceded by diagnostic tests to establish whether variables met the assumptions of the planned regression model. This linear regression model is built under the assumption of independence of subjects but the GDHS has a hierarchical structure with respondents nested within survey clusters which could potentially bias the standard errors. STATA 12.SE, which provides an outlet for handling this problem, is used by imposing on these models a 'cluster' variable, usually the identification numbers of respondents at the cluster level. This in turn adjusts the standard errors producing statistically robust parameter estimates (Cleves et al. 2004; Tenkorang and Owusu, 2010). A positive beta coefficient for any of the covariates indicates high violence, while negative coefficients show low violence.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.0 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I discuss feminist theoretical frameworks on intimate partner violence. Since there are diverse feminist views on intimate partner violence, I have organised this aspect of my work to reflect the geographic locations of feminist scholars. My work is guided by North American and African feminist perspectives on intimate partner violence. As kinship is also central to my thesis, I discuss how scholars in the field of kinship have conceptualized kinship, as a societal institution, more broadly.

3.1 NORTH AMERICAN FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Historically, North American feminist scholarship in the area of domestic violence has been framed in relation to three main themes: gender, power and patriarchy (Anderson, 2002; 2005; 2008). Contemporary feminist scholarship, meanwhile, focuses on diverse experiences of domestic violence as faced by different women in the context of ethnicity and class (McPhail et al., 2007) and kinship. In the sections that follow, I outline the literature in relation to these historical and contemporary themes. These themes will frame this study on marital violence across two kinship groups in Ghana: matrilineal and patrilineal kinship relations.

3.1.1 Historical North American feminist approaches

3.1.1.i Gender

North American feminist scholars understand intimate partner as being gendered. By this, they mean that violence is targeted at women because they are sexed as females and gendered as women (Johnson, 2011; Pallito and O'Campo, 2005). Floretta Boonzaier (2008), argues that the sexed nature of domestic violence can be understood in the context of the social construction of gender. Femininity and masculinity are complexly shaped by societal norms, beliefs, and traditions (West and Zimmerman, 1987). Normative femininity is strongly associated with passivity, submission, servitude and humility to male figures (Kimmel, 2011). Normative masculinity, meanwhile, prizes aggression, strength, and power. As a consequence, societal expectations support a man's use of aggression to assert masculinity, and not femininity (Kimmel and Messner, 2004); Kimmel and Aronson, 2008; Williamson, 2010).

Furthermore, some scholars have theorized domestic violence in the framework of gender performance. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Judith Butler proposes that individuals perform gender. By this gender can be said to be flexible rather than fixed. Gender is about engaging in practices and norms that correlates or defies societal notions and expectations. Butler goes further to argue that while performing gender might seem as a choice, this choice is sanctioned through normative social lenses. Drawing from the work of Judith Butler, Oskala (2012) emphasizes that men's violence in domestic relationships could be recognised as a performance of masculinity. Men perform

this masculinity to assert power, and this hegemonic masculinity is then reinforced by social forces such as income and employment (Boonzaier, 2008). Nonetheless, men could feel emasculated in the absence of aforementioned forces, and in the presence of women's agency against domestic violence (Anderson and Umberson, 2001). While such women are depicted as masculinized, it is unsurprising that studies find that marginalized men often commit violence against women partners to emphasize control which they perceive as lost in their interpersonal relationships (ibid.).

3.1.1.ii Power

Domestic violence scholarship also asserts the centrality of questions of power to understanding the politics of domestic and marital violence. Traditionally, power was viewed as unidirectional; that is, it is exerted from above, against people's interests (Miller, 2003). The Foucauldian view of power, however, suggests that power is multidirectional; that is, power exists in a network of relational bodies (Mills, 2003). The Foucauldian approach acknowledges that power dissipates or moves everywhere. It acts as strategy, involves rational justification, and co-exists with resistance (Allen, 2009). Thinking about power this way helps to examine the ways that gender norms justify men's domestic violence against women. Such gender norms include viewing domestic violence against women as a way of the male partner fulfilling societal expectation of instilling discipline in the home.

Feminist engagements with power in relation to questions of gendered violence in intimate relationships are many. Charles and Hughes-Freeland (2013) suggest that power in

relation to male partner violence implies emphasis on male domination and control, male authority, and superiority. Yoder and Kahn (1992) also indicate that power and gender relations are not separate and argue that society emphasizes power on the part of men in order to assert manhood. This argument is similar to those of Johnson and Ferraro (2000), MacKinnon (2006), Hearn (2012), Kimmel (2002) and Price (2005), all of whom assert that power is the strongest attitudinal predictor of male aggression and violence. In summary, these authors suggest that power imbalance is intertwined with gender inequality, which is at the forefront of violence in the domestic and marital context.

3.1.1.iii *Patriarchy*

Finally, all scholars agree that patriarchal systems premised on notions of male supremacy are central to questions of intimate partner violence. As Goicolea et al. (2012) argue, systems of male supremacy, male power, sexism, male domination and control can be understood as predictors of intimate partner violence. For Zakar, Zakar and Kraemer (2013), the word *patriarchy* evokes notions about male domination versus female subordination (emphasis mine). Lisa Price (2005) equates male supremacy to patriarchy and argues that patriarchal systems engage values, beliefs and norms “to justify and perpetuate the abuse of feminine bodies” (p.25). Similarly, Catherine MacKinnon (2006) points out the particular relevance of the outcome of patriarchal norms: it maintains women’s societal vulnerability and their subsequent abuse.

Male supremacy must be carefully situated. In this thesis, I operate from the principles laid out by Stuart (1994), who defines it as follows: a system of societal institutions and

practices that sustain male domination and superiority, but female abuse. This point is also made by Price (2005), Bennet (2006), Tickner (2001), and Hester (1992), all of whom observe that male supremacy is socially constituted, rather than biological, with Bennet (2006) in particular observing that the system of male supremacy sustains ideologies in the form of social and political education so as to justify men's violence. In addition to this, Joan Acker notes that male supremacy is maintained by women's subordinate position, which is largely structural and institutionalized (Myers, et al., 1998). These authors stress the relatedness of the private and public spheres, where the former is an effect of the latter. In other words, violence in domestic relationships is considered a consequence of patriarchal structures and institutions that ensure discrimination and abuse of women within their homes and families. Moreover, the dynamics of gender are acknowledged by these authors as being central to the distribution of privilege. Nonetheless, gendered privilege differs across many societies in the context of ethnicity, and class. Thus, for instance, societies across the sub-Saharan region record highest levels of gender-based violence, because, as Hunnicut (2009) notes, the manifestations of patriarchy are possibly strongest in this region.

3.1.2 Contemporary North American feminist thought

As stated in the previous chapter, "difference" has been central to recent feminist scholarship. While maintaining the gendered analysis established by their predecessors, contemporary North American feminist scholars are also attentive to issues of intimate partner violence in the context of an intersectional framework (Cramer and Plummer,

2008). Intersectionality is a concept arising from postmodern thinking, and Kimberlé Crenshaw formally introduced this term in her work in 1989. Crenshaw argues that treating race and gender as mutually exclusive categories of experience and analysis distorts the experiences of Black women, and further, this theoretically erases them from the discussion of sex or race discrimination. Crenshaw thus advocates for a holistic discussion of women's oppression or privilege, one that encompasses the intersections of multiple forms of discrimination. McCall (2005) takes this further in arguing that intersectionality helps to point out the "limitation of gender as an analytical category" (p. 1771). An intersectional approach involves the examination of "relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relationships and subject formations" (McCall, 2005). An intersectional perspective, therefore, concerns an acknowledgement of diversity of experiences across groups and between individuals, and this can be applied to domestic violence scholarship. Strid, Walby and Armstrong (2013) have also highlighted intersectional analysis in relation to violence against women by noting that it is important to analyse interlocking workings of multiple systems of vulnerabilities within structural, historical and political contexts.

Studies demonstrate that factors such as socioeconomic status and ethnicity, for example, either confer power on women to resist male violence or increase women's vulnerability to male violence (see Anderson, 1997; 2010). For instance, women with employment and high economic status experience very low levels of male aggression and abuse (see Jewkes, Levin and Penn-Kekana, 2002; WHO, 2012; Anderssen et al., 2012; Kiss, et al., 2012).

Counter to economically capable and employed women, women with no employment and with low socioeconomic status often find it difficult to leave abusive intimate relationships (WHO, 2012). In most cases, such women sustain their livelihoods on the male partner's income. Likewise, the inability to leave an abusive marriage results in much more violence from the male intimate partner. Though the socioeconomic status of women is generally a developmental concern, some research findings indicate that women's empowerment risks male violence in the private sphere. Because the empowerment of women challenges traditional male authority, male partners will sometimes resist such feminine power through violence (Vyas and Watts, 2008).

Last but not the least, an intersectional approach helps to think about women's risk of male violence in the context of ethnicity. Different attachment to ethnic norms in Ghana means that women may experience different socialization and diverse understandings of intimate partner violence. For example, in Ghana, ethnic groups espousing matrilineal descent rules often make it possible for their women to own properties and lands, unlike those ethnic groups embracing patrilineal norms (Ferrara, 2007). As I have previously noted in my introductory chapter, matrilineal groups, compared to their patrilineal counterparts, believe that the sustenance of the lineage is through a maternal ancestress, and this belief often confers economic power on women belonging to this kinship group (Oppong, 2001). Such socioeconomic position of women in matrilineal societies in Ghana could offer, as I have already indicated, the basis for resistance against male partner violence.

3.2 AFRICAN FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Like many African scholars, I think it is important to theorize domestic violence from an African-sensitive perspective. An African-sensitive approach generates discussions and analysis of African belief systems, such as kinship, that could help in the acceptance of, and/or resistance to domestic violence against women.

African feminist frameworks on domestic violence are relatively similar to those of their North American counterparts in that both groups of scholars highlight unequal societal expectations of men and women. More specifically, in African feminist scholarship, intimate partner violence is attributed to the cultural ethos of some societies that promote unequal gender and power relations (Ofei-Aboagye, 1994; Illika 2005, 2006). In the domestic context, some traditional values emphasize the need for men to have their sexual, physical and emotional needs gratified by their female partners. In this view, male domestic gratification is seen as a “right” and women will go at any length to satisfy their male partners at the expense of their abuse (Amoah, 2007). African feminist scholars argue that women’s experiences in the domestic sphere are shaped by sociocultural feminine expectations of servility and humility, whereas masculine traits, such as bravery and domination are attached to, and expected of men. These feminine and masculine values are mediated and supported through cultural performances such as marriage.

However, despite the similarities in their theoretical underpinnings, it is also important to consider the differences. Nwando Achebe (2014) notes that African feminist scholarship,

by and large, is centered around challenging western theoretical impositions on African lived experiences. The main issue here lies in challenging gender essentialism and over generalizations embedded within western and North American theoretical frameworks (ibid.). According to Nwando, African feminist scholars' positional theorizing should be African-sensitive: African feminist scholars birth theories using insider lenses (Achebe, 2014).

Following from Achebe's work, African feminist scholars (such as Ampofo, 2001, 2008; Amoakohene, 2004) have, for the most part, theorized about intimate partner violence from a relatively insider viewpoint, either from the point of view of personal experience or from that of witnessing. These feminist scholars collect data on women, analyse, and interpret realities of domestic violence against women within distinct African contexts and situations: historical, political, economic, cultural and social.

Similarly, and counter to North American theorization of gender and power in their traditional societies, Ifi Amadiume (1987) argues that roles and behaviour expectations in Nnobi (an African traditional community in southeastern Nigeria) are neither masculinized nor feminized. Cultural norms often support women and men's participation in all spheres of life, including power, privilege and bravery. Notions about male-domination and the subsequent marginalization of women in contemporary Nnobi, for example, are outcomes of cultural and political imposition through colonialism, western religion and education (Amadiume, 1987). These theories challenge my analyses of the experiences of Ghanaian

victims of domestic violence in the context of their sociocultural positions. I discuss conceptual approaches to kinship in the next section.

3.3 THE SOCIOCULTURAL INSTITUTION OF KINSHIP

Jonathan Turner (1997) sees social institutions as a:

complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures and organizing relatively stable patterns of human activity with respect to fundamental problems in producing life-sustaining resources, in reproducing individuals and in sustaining viable societal structures within a given environment. (p.6)

By this Turner means to suggest that social institutions are instruments of controlling human behaviour and populations. For Mohr and White (2008), “institutions are linkage mechanisms that bridge across three kinds of social divides—they link micro systems of social interaction to meso (and macro) levels of organization, they connect the symbolic with the material, and the agentic with the structural.” (p.485). What this means is that social institutions are building blocks of the larger society.

Generally, kinship, as a societal institution, has been seen as an organizing principle in many societies worldwide (Carsten 1999; Read, 2001). According to David Read, kinship has been understood as familial relations, reckoned through descent (consanguinity) and marriage (affinity). It serves as an important site for continuing human generations (Read, 2001). For Laurie and Stark (2012), and Sotirin and Ellingson (2007), kinship is a place of

socialization, distribution of privilege, a primary place for mapping social roles and behaviour expectations as well as entrenching preferences.

Kinship systems determine the way a given society defines and utilizes relations of kinship, involving the rights and responsibilities or obligations recognised across kin or groups of kin, and these rights and obligations include political, social, economic and cultural connections (Read, 2001). Relationships established on the basis of kinship systems often vary between or across societies (ibid.). For example, Ghana's kinship system, which I have explored earlier in this thesis, often focuses attention on descent from an ancestress or ancestor, and this descent confers membership to either matrilineal or patrilineal kinship system respectively (Awusabo-Asare, 1990; Nukunya, 2003).

While critical scholarship has generally associated kinship with relationships within a given biological family, Judith Butler (2004; 2002) conceptualizes kinship differently. She understands kinship as "practices [...] that emerge to address fundamental forms of human dependency, which may include birth, child-rearing, relations of emotional dependency and support, generational ties, illness, dying, and death [to name a few]" in a given community (p.103). Thus, for Butler, kinship moves beyond the notion of blood ties to include broader notions of emotional and psychological commitment. For Butler (2000), kinship is not necessarily an oppressive social institution. Instead, she argues that "kinship conditions the possibility of politics" of interpersonal hetero and homo relations thus implying that kinship could facilitate agency, resistance, power, and oppression (Butler, 2000, p.2).

Given that kinship encompasses assigning rights and responsibilities, contemporary feminist scholarship have focussed on analyzing the interaction between kinship and gender relations (see Collier and Yanagisako, 1987; Franklin and McKinnon, 2001). Such feminist scholars argue that kinship is an enabling site for everyday hierarchical relatedness between women and men in a given community (Collier and Yanagisako, 1987; Franklin and McKinnon, 2001). More specifically, kinship is embedded in specific patriarchal expectations and as such, is a focal place where women's subordinate position is enacted (Lloyd, Few and Allen, 2009). However, on the basis of kinship, women's subordinate status might not be considered universal. As Linda Stone (1997) argues, kinship and gender are mutually socially constituted in that kinship shape gender relations across different kinship systems, as I have pointed out in the Ghanaian situation. Stone (1997) argues further that kinship can be said to be an ideology of human relations, implying that kinship is a product of human thinking, mores, customs, traditions, and beliefs.

Thinking about kinship as a product of human beliefs and as a politicized societal institution helps to acknowledge women's dynamics in relation to Ghanaian kinship systems: matrilineal and patrilineal kinship ties. Because kinship systems often differ in the way they shape interpersonal and gender relations, outcomes of gender inequality, for example, marital violence against women may be different.

To summarize, in this chapter, I have discussed feminist theoretical views on intimate partner violence. These feminist frameworks are important to my work, for the reason that

they highlight unequal gender and power relations as central to domestic violence. In particular, these feminist theories allow me to examine the relationship between different levels of gender inequality across kin groups and marital violence in Ghana. Later in the chapter, I introduced the notion of intersectionality, a conceptual framing which has been central to much contemporary feminist scholarship. An intersectional lens enables me to pay close attention to socio-cultural differences and how these shape women's experiences of intimate partner violence in Ghana. Finally, I have outlined different approaches to the concept of kinship. A consideration of kinship as a politicized societal institution that helps to facilitate agency, resistance and oppression of women. In the next chapter, I discuss my results and analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, I discuss my results. I keep feminist and intersectional frameworks in mind. Given the quantitative nature of my thesis, I employ regression coefficients or percentages to describe my findings. I have organised these results in a tabular format. First, I provide descriptive analyses as captured by both the univariate and bivariate or zero-order findings as detailed in Tables 1 and 2. The descriptive analyses describe the sample and provide the reader with some insights on the direction and magnitude of the relationships between predictor and outcome variables. I present the multivariate results in Tables 3 through 5. These provide the net effects of predictor variables on the dependent variables. Finally, thresholds for P-values are indicated below the tables and significant results are shown in asterisks.

4.1 RESULTS

Table 1 presents a univariate distribution of outcome and predictor variables. Results indicate that both physical and sexual violence are higher in patrilineal than matrilineal societies. However, women from matrilineal societies report higher emotional violence compared to those in patrilineal societies. Furthermore, descriptive analyses show some socio-economic differences among women from the matrilineal kin groups compared to those in patrilineal kin groups. For instance, while almost half of women in patrilineal societies report having no formal education, only 11% from matrilineal societies indicate

so. Regarding wealth, I observe that 38.3% of women in patrilineal societies are in the poorest wealth quintile compared to 6.8% in matrilineal societies.

Turning to the sociocultural variables (which include justification for wife-beating), it is clear that women in patrilineal societies justify wife-beating (0.0705) relatively higher compared to those in matrilineal (-0.0831) societies. Religious belief and practice are also of interest. A majority of women (92.5%) from the matrilineal kin group identify as Christians compared to 58.2% from the patrilineal societies. Fewer women in the matrilineal group, 2.8%, say they are Muslims compared to women in patrilineal societies, 27.2%. Descriptive analyses also indicate that 1% of matrilineal women identify with traditional religion, while 9.7% of women in patrilineal communities identify with such religion. A lower percentage of women in matrilineal societies identify with no religion, 3.6%, compared to women in patrilineal communities, 4.9%.

The univariate distribution reveals a substantial difference between urbanized women from matrilineal societies (45.5%) and patrilineal societies (33.4 %). Differences also exist among matrilineal and patrilineal women in terms of their region of residence. The percentages of these differences among matrilineal and patrilineal groups are as follows: Greater Accra (11.1%, 12.3%); Central region (14.8%, 1.5%); Western region (18.2%, 3.5%); Volta region (0.7%, 16%); Eastern region (11.7%, 7.6%); Ashanti region (28.6%, 5.8%); Brong Ahafo region (14.1%, 6.5) and Northern region (0.7%, 46.9%) respectively. This confirms what I noted previously in my introduction that matrilineal Akans mostly occupy regions in southwestern Ghana: the percentages for matrilineal are higher in

central, Western, Eastern, Ashanti and Brong Ahafo regions; because in these regions, the Akan indigenous population form the majority, compared to settler patrilineal communities (see Kutsoati, 2012). The same applies to the other regions.

Table 2 shows bivariate associations between predictor and outcome variables. Results do not show strong statistical associations between socio-economic predictors and the various measures of violence. However, I note that while women with primary and secondary education in both matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups experience higher levels of sexual violence in relation to women in both kinship groups with no education, women in patrilineal kin groups with higher education experience less sexual and emotional violence than women in matrilineal kin group. Women who justified wife-beating and reported higher levels of dominance by husbands also experienced higher levels of physical and emotional violence in both matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups, and higher levels of sexual violence in only patrilineal societies.

Moreover, I observe that coefficients for these variables are relatively larger for women in patrilineal than matrilineal kin groups. Women, in particular, those from patrilineal kin groups who witnessed family violence (father beating mother), reported higher levels of physical, sexual and emotional violence. Also, women with husbands who drank alcohol reported higher levels of physical, sexual and emotional violence in both matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups. Among the patrilineal and matrilineal kin lines, I note religious

differences. Compared to Christians, Muslim women report lower sexual and emotional violence in both patrilineal and matrilineal kin groups.

Finally, Tables 3, 4 and 5 present multivariate results. I have subdivided these tables into two separate models for each dimension of intimate partner violence. The first model includes socio-cultural predictors with demographic variables controlled and the second model adds socio-economic predictors. Consistent with the bivariate findings, I observe that socio-economic predictors are not strongly associated with the various measures of violence. However, I note that compared to those with no education, women with primary and secondary education report higher sexual violence. Also, compared to the poorest, poorer women from matrilineal kin groups report lower levels of emotional violence. Turning to the socio-cultural predictors, I observe further that unlike the bivariate analysis where justification for wife-beating was statistically significant, this was not the case in the multivariate analyses.

Consistent with the bivariate analyses, I find that women who reported stronger domineering attitudes by their husbands experienced higher levels of physical and emotional violence in both matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups. This is different for sexual abuse where only women from the patrilineal kin groups reported higher sexual violence. Moreover, past exposure to family violence appears to point to women's present experience of domestic violence. Women from both patrilineal and matrilineal kin groups

who saw their fathers beat their mothers reported higher physical and sexual violence than those who did not witness such violence.

However, witnessing the father beat the mother seems to be higher for patrilineal women. Compared to those whose husbands do not, women whose husbands drank alcohol experienced all three types of violence in both matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups. Some demographic/control variables are statistically associated with types of violence. For instance, rural women from patrilineal kin groups report less physical violence than urban women. Compared to Christians from patrilineal kin groups, Muslim women from patrilineal kin groups report higher emotional violence.

I summarize the findings as the following: there are higher coefficients of physical and sexual violence in patrilineal societies, women in matrilineal societies seem to experience more emotional violence, justification for wife-beating and husband's control are strongest predictors of marital violence, and women's education seems to reduce the likelihood of domestic violence.

4.2 DISCUSSION/ ANALYSIS

As noted in the Introduction, domestic and marital violence against women is a global problem (United Nations, 2000). It transcends boundaries of culture, class, education, income, ethnicity, age (Panda and Agarwal, 2005; Kishor and Johnson, 2006) and religion (Minka-Premo, 2001). Also, domestic and marital violence is acknowledged as a violation of the fundamental human rights of victims; particularly, marital violence against women is regarded as an obstacle to achieving gender equity (United Nations, 2000). That is to say that intimate partner violence against women is often seen as a symptom of society's gendered bias towards its members. In sub-Saharan African countries, such as Ghana, the occurrence of intimate partner violence against women is highest (WHO, 2013) and this is attributed to pervasive support for patriarchal norms (International Center for Research on Women, 2009).

Other studies point to the impact of poverty on domestic violence (Browning 2002; Benson et al., 2003). As most countries in sub-Saharan Africa including Ghana strive to attain United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such violence undermines human development goals due to its negative impact on health and psychosocial well-being. In my research, I have been particularly interested in teasing out the possible links between kinship and domestic violence. Understanding the intersections between kinship and domestic violence is of pragmatic relevance in that it may help policy makers to better recognise and respond to the different vulnerabilities experienced by women in matrilineal and patrilineal kin groups.

The finding that physical and sexual violence are rife in patrilineal societies, in comparison with matrilineal societies is testament to how differences in the gender ordering within these kin groups can influence interpersonal relationships and domestic violence. This finding corroborates earlier assertions (Manuh, 1997; Takyi and Gyimah, 2007) that perhaps the level of respectability for women in matrilineal societies is high and level of patriarchy low compared to women in patrilineal societies. Respect for women in matrilineal communities can be attributed to kinship norms that support matrilineal women's active participation in decision making in traditional politics.

In the theoretical realm, the prevalence of physical and sexual violence within patrilineal communities is consistent with feminist explanations of domestic violence, which emphasize that female physical and sexual battering are symptoms of strong patriarchal systems. In such patriarchal strongholds, community members uphold terrains of domination mainly by sexed males over females through every means possible, including physical and sexual aggression (Price, 2005; McPhail et al., 2007; Dragiewicz and DeKeseredy, 2012).

One interesting result is the fact that women in matrilineal societies experience higher levels of emotional violence in comparison with their counterparts in patrilineal societies. Higher levels of emotional violence in matrilineal societies may be indicative that patriarchy, as expressed in the two respective kin groups, takes different forms, and that varieties of vulnerability to male violence exist in Ghanaian societies. Thus, for example,

women in matrilineal societies experience more emotional violence whereas women in patrilineal societies experience more physical and sexual violence. Because emotional violence is understood to precede physical and sexual violence (Jewkes, 2002), it is possible to conclude that the restraining force of matriarchal norms serves as an important check on male partners from inflicting physical bodily harm on their female partners. In *The Position of the Chief in the Modern Political System of Ashanti: Study of the Influence of Contemporary Social Changes on Ashanti Political Institutions*, Busia (1968) states that matriarchal norms among the Akans in Ghana recognize women as carriers of the lineage. For this reason, I would argue that this traditional recognition of women as “carriers of the lineage” cushions them against physical abuse or harm from members of the group. It is also worth noting in this regard that this privileged social role may also make it possible for such women to articulate emotional violence; for women in strongly patrilineal kin groups who experience higher levels of physical and sexual violence, emotional violence may not register as violence at all.

Furthermore, my study illustrates the internal workings of the patriarchy and this, too, is consistent with feminist explanations about outcomes of patriarchy-centered society. As espoused by many feminist scholars such as Price (2005), Myers, et al. (1998) and Bennet (2006), male supremacy is often maintained through female vulnerability within socioeconomic, political and cultural divisions. For instance, descriptive analyses show that in comparison with women in patrilineal societies, women in matrilineal societies are advantaged in terms of greater economic and educational access. This finding suggests that

patrilineal norms can be linked with institutional measures that deliberately or non-deliberately work to disadvantage women thus rendering them socioeconomically vulnerable. Following from this and with Michael Foucault's analysis of power in mind, which I have explored previously in chapter 3, the results of my study seem to suggest that sociocultural norms that dictate power relations between sexes may not be static. Rather, it is clear that such norms help distribute power through available mediums (socioeconomic, political and cultural) to endorse gendered power relations in the domestic sphere.

Given the fluidity of power, the impact of male dominance on the various dimensions of violence is instructive. Throughout my data description and analysis (bivariate, and multivariate levels), I realize that male dominance is the strongest attitudinal factor for higher rates of emotional, physical, and sexual violence within domestic relationships. In the context of this study, the evidence that there is a positive correlation between male dominance and intimate partner violence is consistent with other studies. Authors such as Badcock, et al., (1993), Dunkle, et al. (2004), and Anderson & Umberson, (2001) have demonstrated in their works that questions of male power, and male superiority are central to domestic and marital violence across many societies.

In my study, I take particular note of the strong effects of male dominance on sexual violence in patrilineal societies. This finding provides an interesting practical expression for feminist conceptual lenses on domestic violence, which posit that domestic violence is sexed and gendered, with male domination as the strongest predictor. D'cruze & Rao

(2005) and Johnson & Ferraro (2000) consider male domination as an outcome of patriarchal systems that work to keep sexed females, and gendered women under societal control. Physical and sexual violence can be understood as symptoms of this process. It is therefore not surprising that my data reports higher levels of husbands' control and violence in patrilineal societies. Nonetheless, Ghanaian women's justification of wife-beating, and in particular, Ghanaian women from patrilineal kin groups' higher justification of violence could mean that kinship norms provide the grounds for justifying male domination and subsequent violence.

While highlighting feminist views on patriarchal systems as central to domestic violence, my results appear to be consistent with the conclusions drawn by scholars utilizing intersectional frameworks. Intersectional scholarship has highlighted women's diverse experiences of norms and social conditions that help to create and continue female abuse (see Crenshaw, 1989; 1991; McCall, 2005). My results suggest that in Ghana, kinship norms create a principal division among women. As previously mentioned, this difference among Ghanaian women is evident both in the ways they experience their vulnerabilities to male partner violence and in expressions of patriarchy along patrilineal and matrilineal kinship lines. While female vulnerabilities to male partner violence are an outcome of prevailing matrilineal and patrilineal norms, expressions of patriarchy revolve around the terrains of power available to men and women in socioeconomic, political and cultural realms.

Although, there is no positive correlation between women's wealth and emotional, physical, and sexual violence in this study, women's educational levels are relevant, particularly in patrilineal kin societies. Indeed, other studies suggest that educational attainment proves to be the singular most powerful tool against domestic violence (Sen, 1999; Jewkes, 2002). These scholars argue that education has a formative effect on the person, in the process conferring lifetime skills that help women resist and negotiate disagreements in their private relationships.

However, the finding that women with primary and secondary education report more male partner sexual abuse than women with no education at all at the bivariate and multivariate levels could suggest that lack of education helps breed ignorance and possible acceptance of domestic violence on the part of many women. In such instances, cases of domestic abuse could go unrecognised and consequently, unreported. Of particular relevance to intersectional scholarship is the fact that socioeconomic conditions that enact lack of education on the part of some women may combine with gendered vulnerability to further create enabling conditions for domestic violence (Cramer and Plummer, 2009).

In addition, results from my study establish differences between matrilineal and patrilineal women in relation to past experiences of family violence. While women report that past experiences of family violence increase their risk of experiencing intimate partner violence, women in matrilineal societies seem to report less past experience of family violence than women in patrilineal societies. The finding that women in matrilineal societies report low

levels of past family violence implies that children in these societies also witness wife beating by their fathers less often. These childhood experiences can fundamentally alter childhood development. Edleson (1999), Steinberg, et al. (1993) and Kitzmann, et al. (2003) note that children who witness domestic violence could experience behavioural, emotional, and cognitive-functioning problems during their formative years.

Understanding the impact of marital violence on children, particularly those in patrilineal societies is important if developmental problems are to be addressed from a social policy perspective in Ghana.

Across matrilineal and patrilineal kin-groups, my finding of a strong positive relationship between husband's alcohol drinking behaviors and marital violence (both physical and sexual abuse) is supported by such studies as Soler, Vinayak & Quadagno, 2000; Pandey, Dutt & Banerjee, 2009 and Oladepo, Yusuf & Arulogun, 2011, as well as Kiss et al. 2012. While it is difficult to determine the independent role of husband's alcohol use on marital violence, Pandey, Dutt and Banerjee (2009) observe that alcohol use may sometimes provide socially acceptable reasons for husbands beating their wives.

Finally, religious differences between matrilineal and patrilineal women in relation to levels of prevalence of marital violence is worth noting. As indicated previously, on the whole, women in matrilineal kin groups are more likely to be affiliated with Christianity, while women in patrilineal kin groups report higher affiliations with Islam and Traditional religions. However, the finding that Christian women report higher sexual and emotional

violence in both patrilineal and matrilineal kin groups in relation to Muslim women is intriguing. I postulate that the largely Christian women in matrilineal kin groups may enjoy more enabling resources – such as education – and are thus better equipped to identify and report domestic violence than their patrilineal kin group counterparts.

In this chapter, I have discussed statistically significant relationships between dependent and independent variables. These statistical associations are interpreted within the context of feminist theories on domestic violence, and literature on kinship.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

5.0 CONCLUSION

In this thesis I have sought to examine the effect of sociocultural norms on marital violence between matrilineal and patrilineal kinship groups using Ghana Demographic and Health Survey. In Chapter 1, I outlined my research questions and provided a review of the literature. Chapter 2 laid out my methodological and epistemological frameworks and the statistical tools used for analyses. In Chapter 3 I delved into feminist perspectives on domestic violence and kinship. In chapter 4, I described my findings and analyze the relationships between dependent and independent variables. In this final chapter, I give an overview of all the aforementioned chapters and acknowledge the implications of my findings and the limitations of this study.

5.1 OVERVIEW OF LITERATURE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

In Ghana, like other developing countries, domestic violence has become a primary concern among the growing community of researchers and policy makers who are interested in women's societal status (Koenig et al., 2003). Domestic violence has been viewed as an abuse of fundamental human rights, and it is often associated with acute and chronic health problems (WHO, 2013). The United Nations recognizes domestic violence as an act of "gender-based violence that results in, or is likely to result in physical, sexual, or psychological harm [...] occurring in private life" (United Nation's 1993). Scholars such as Minkah-Premo (2001) observe that domestic violence is sexed and gendered; thus in this

context, marital violence can be understood as a product of gender inequality (Jewkes, Levin and Penn-Kekana, 2003; McCloskey, et al., 2005).

Despite the attention to domestic violence issues and its outcomes in Ghana, it appears less attention has been drawn to the interaction between kinship and violence in marital relations in the domestic sphere. My research fills this void in literature.

Ghanaian socialization of women often confers either patrilineal or matrilineal kinship rights or obligations. With this, I sought to accomplish the following objectives: (i) to determine the levels of marital violence across matrilineal and patrilineal kinship groups; (ii) to examine the sociocultural norms that influence the extent of marital violence between matrilineal and patrilineal women; and (iii) to examine the extent and level of male domination, and women's justification of marital violence in both lineages.

5.2 OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

In the context of this research, I was guided by feminist approaches to research and scholarship. Because feminist approaches to research are about political accountability, I have been reflexive about my influences on this research. I interrogated the ways in which my social positioning and identities have influence on my choice of research topic, theoretical foundations, and method, as well as the analysis of results, implications and limitations of this study. Given all of this, I do not make claims for value-free outcome of this research. Because women's experiences of marital violence are central to this research, I have made claims of epistemic viability of this work in the context of feminist approaches

to research. I drew on data from the most recent version of the Ghana Demographic and Survey (GDHS, 2008), and focused most specifically on the Women's Questionnaire. My study is limited to 1835 ever-married women, aged 15-49 years who answered questions on physical, sexual and emotional violence.

5.3 OVERVIEW OF THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretical foundations of this research include the following: (i) African and North American feminist frameworks on intimate partner violence, and (ii) scholarship on kinship. Both African and North American feminist theoretical views highlight unequal gender and power relations as central to domestic violence. African feminist critiques of Western and North American feminist theories helped me to appreciate domestic violence within specific Ghanaian cultural context. Similarly, the concept of intersectionality allowed me to pay close attention to socio-cultural differences and how these shape women's experiences of intimate partner violence in Ghana.

5.4 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

In this research, major findings include: (i) Higher coefficients of physical and sexual violence in patrilineal societies; (ii) Women in matrilineal societies seem to experience more emotional violence; (iii) Justification for wife-beating and husband's control are strongest predictors of marital violence; and (iv) Women's education seem to reduce the likelihood of domestic violence. I have contextualized these findings within the literature and theoretical framework for this study.

5.5 IMPLICATIONS

Several policy implications emerge from my research project. First, it is clear that policy makers cannot prescribe a single homogenous intervention for dealing with male partner violence against married women in Ghana. Interventions that pay particular attention to kin group affiliation are needed. That is to say interventions for reducing marital violence in Ghana should be sensitive to women's ethnicity and kinship.

Second, it is important to enhance women's independence and assertiveness by encouraging formal education, especially for women in patrilineal societies. Providing women with such opportunities may help to correct the power imbalances that characterize marital unions and dealing with the cultural barriers that constrain women's ability to seek equality in their relationships.

Most importantly, my research illuminates the centrality of employing feminist sensitive and intersectionally-oriented approaches to curbing domestic violence against women in Ghana. As I have previously explained, a feminist conceptual lens helps to appreciate the fact that gendered nature of domestic violence stems from gendered power relations which could intersect with other social factors such as class to increase vulnerabilities for enacting and perpetuating male partner violence.

5.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Despite the interesting findings and policy implications from my study, there are some limitations worth acknowledging. Ghana's resources are unequally distributed with respect to geographic locations of populations. As is the situation in many societies, rural access to education is limited, particularly in comparison with urban access to education (Acheampong et al., 2007). In my study, I note that there are more patrilineal women, compared to matrilineal women in rural Ghana. This means that patrilineal women's low access to education can be attributed to structural disadvantage as a result of Ghana's unequal access to modern resources.

Another limitation of my study is that it is limited to the experiences of violence among married women, aged 15-49 years who answered questions related to domestic violence in the GDHS survey. This means that evidence from this study may not apply to the experiences of violence among married women who are above 49 years. I think it is relevant that this cut off comes just as many women are entering into menopause, what Simone de Beauvoir (1964) positions as the "third sex", a time in which many women are no longer 'reproductively useful' within the contours of a patriarchal society. Furthermore, these women are considered less attractive and ill for male attention and subsequent quest to control them (Gannon, 1999).

Meanwhile, the use of cross-sectional data means I am unable to draw direct causal connections between independent (predictor) and dependent (outcome) variables. Arias

and Beach (1987) raise concerns about the reliability of surveys based on self-reports especially when they border on sensitive issues like violence within marriages. It is thus possible that physical, sexual and emotional violence will be under-reported especially among married couples given the stigma and other related consequences attached to reporting such incidence. As Cantalupo et al. (2006) note, stigmatization attached to reporting marital abuse in Ghana means that many issues of violence in marriages, such as marital rape, go unreported. Notwithstanding, including information on marital violence on the GDHS, and the circumstances surrounding such incidence is useful for understanding marital violence and formulating policies against it in Ghana.

In conclusion, it is significant to note that gender socialization in Ghana is often understood as conferring either matrilineal or patrilineal privileges and obligations. Despite a primary concern about eradicating domestic violence in Ghana, there seems to be a lack of attention to the interaction between kin-group affiliation and marital violence. Using the 2008 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey (GDHS), and applying feminist theories on domestic violence and quantitative techniques (OLS), this study examined the causes of marital violence among matrilineal and patrilineal kin-groups.

Findings indicate that patrilineal norms increase vulnerability to intimate partner physical and sexual violence while matrilineal women experience more emotional violence. Education, however, could be an important tool against marital violence, especially in patrilineal societies. I have explained these findings in the context of prevailing literature

and feminist scholarship on domestic violence as well as scholarship on kinship. My study helps policy makers to appreciate dynamics among Ghanaian women when formulating policies aimed at addressing and eradicating domestic violence in Ghana. Finally, evidence from this study is limited to married women aged 15-49 year.

REFERENCES

- Ababio, M. H. (2000). *Trokosi, worryokwe, cultural and individual rights: A case study of women's empowerment and community rights in Ghana*. Unpublished master's thesis, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Aboagye-Offei, R. (1994). Altering the Strands of the Fabric: A Preliminary Look at Domestic Violence in Ghana. *Signs*, 19(4), 924-938.
- Achampong, E., & Sampson, F. (2010). Marital Rape in Ghana: Legal Options for Achieving State Accountability. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 22(2), 505-534.
- Achebe, N. (2014). Twenty-Five Years of African Women Writing African Women's and Gendered Worlds. *Journal of Women's History*, 25(4), 275-287.
- Ackerly, B., & True, J. (2008). Reflexivity in practice: Power and ethics in feminist research on international relations. *International Studies Review*, 10(4), 693-707.
- Adinkrah, M. (2008). Spousal Homicides in contemporary Ghana. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(3), 209-216.
- Adomako Ampofo, A. (2008). Collective activism: The Domestic Violence Bill becoming Law in Ghana. *African and Asian Studies*, 7(4), 395-395.
- Akyeampong, K., Djangmah, J., Oduro, A., Seidu, A., & Hunt, F. (2007). *Access to basic education in Ghana: The evidence and the issues*. Brighton: University of Sussex
- Alcoff, L., Alcoff, L. M., & Potter, E. (Eds.). (2013). *Feminist epistemologies*. London: Routledge.
- Alexander, C. J. (2002). Violence in gay and lesbian relationships. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, 14(1), 95-98.
- Allen, A. (2009). Discourse, power, and subjectivation: the Foucault/Habermas debate reconsidered. *The Philosophical Forum*, 40(1), 1-28.
- Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Gender symmetry, sexism, and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11), 1816-1834.
- Amadiume, I. (1987). *Male daughters, female husbands: Gender and sex in an African society*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Ameh, R. K. (2001). *Child bondage in Ghana: a contextual policy analysis of trokosi*. Doctoral dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia.

- Amnesty International (2004). *The state of the world's human rights*. Geneva: Switzerland.
- Amoah, J. (2007). The world on her shoulders: The rights of the girl-child in the context of culture and identity. *Essex Human Rights Review*, 4(2), 1-23.
- Amoakohene, M. I. (2004). Violence against women in Ghana: a look at women's perceptions and review of policy and social responses. *Social Science & Medicine*, 59(11), 2373-2385.
- Ampofo, A. A. (1993). Controlling and punishing women: Violence against Ghanaian women. *Review of African Political Economy*, 20(56), 102-111.
- Ampofo, A. A. (2001). 'When men speak women listen': Gender socialization and young adolescents' attitudes to sexual and reproductive issues. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 5(3), 196-212.
- Ampofo, A. A. (2008). Collective activism: The Domestic Violence Bill becoming Law in Ghana. *African and Asian Studies*, 7(4), 395-395.
- Anarfi, J. K., & Owusu, A. Y. (2011). The making of a sexual being in Ghana: The state, religion and the influence of society as agents of sexual socialization. *Sexuality & Culture*, 15(1), 1-18.
- Anderson, K. L. (1997). Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 59(3), 655-669.
- Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64(4), 851-863.
- Anderson, K. L. (2005). Theorizing gender in intimate partner violence research. *Sex Roles*, 52(11-12), 853-865.
- Anderson, K. L. (2008). Is partner violence worse in the context of control? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1157-1168.
- Anderson, K. L. (2009). Gendering coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 15(12), 1444-1457.
- Anderson, K. L. (2010). Conflict, power, and violence in families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 726-742.
- Anderson, K. L. (2013). Why do we fail to ask "Why" about Gender and Intimate Partner Violence? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75(2), 314-318.
- Anderson, K. L., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and Power in Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence. *Gender and Society*, 15(3), 358-380.

- Andersson, N., Ho-Foster, A., Mitchell, S., Scheepers, E., & Goldstein, S. (2007). Risk factors for domestic physical violence: national cross-sectional household surveys in eight southern African countries. *BMC Women's Health*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Antonacopoulou, E., & Tsoukas, H. (2002). Time and reflexivity in organization studies: an introduction. *Organization Studies*, 23(6), 857-862.
- Archampong, E., & Sampson, F. (2010). Marital Rape in Ghana: Legal Options for Achieving State Accountability. *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law*, 22(2), 505-534.
- Archer, L. (2004, December). Re/theorizing "difference" in feminist research. *Women's Studies International Forum* 27 (5), 459-473).
- Ard, K. L., & Makadon, H. J. (2011). Addressing intimate partner violence in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender patients. *Journal of general internal medicine*, 26(8), 930-933.
- Ardayfio-Schandorf, E. (2005). *Violence against women: The Ghanaian case*. United Nations Division for the Advancement of Women. Geneva: Switzerland.
- Arias, I., & Beach, S. R. (1987). Validity of self-reports of marital violence. *Journal of family violence*, 2(2), 139-149.
- Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, J., & Lofland, L. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Awusabo-Asare, K. (1990). Matriliny and the new intestate succession law of Ghana. *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 24(1), 1-16.
- Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1), 40-50.
- Balogun, M. O., Owoaje, E. T., & Fawole, O. I. (2012). Intimate partner violence in southwestern Nigeria: Are there rural-urban differences? *Women & Health*, 52(7), 627.
- Bennett, J. M. (2006). *History matters: patriarchy and the challenge of feminism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Beauvoir, S. d. (1964). *The second sex*. New York: Knopf.
- Blosnich, J. R., & Bossarte, R. M. (2009). Comparisons of intimate partner violence among partners in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(12), 2182-2184.

Boateng, W. (2012). *It's Only a Hoodwink who Doesn't Change the Mind: A Sociological Lens on Family Stress, Domestic Violence and Health*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.

Bograd, M. (1999). Strengthening domestic violence theories: Intersections of race, class, sexual orientation, and gender. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 25(3), 275-289.

Bott, S. et al. (2012). *Violence Against Women in Latin America and the Caribbean: A comparative analysis of population-based data from 12 countries*. Washington DC: Pan American Health Organisation.

Brownridge, D. A., & Halli, S. S. (2001). *Explaining violence against women in Canada*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

Brush, L. D. (2005). Philosophical and political issues in research on women's violence and aggression. *Sex roles*, 52(11-12), 867-873.

Burke, T. W., Jordan, M. L., & Owen, S. S. (2002). A cross-national comparison of gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 18(3), 231-257.

Burns, J. M. (2009). *Female voices from an Ewe dance-drumming community in Ghana: Our music has become a divine spirit*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Busia, K. A. (1968). *The position of the chief in the modern political system of Ashanti: A study of the influence of contemporary social changes on Ashanti political institutions*. London: Frank Cass.

Butler, J. (2000). *Antigone's Claim: Kinship between Life and Death*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Butler, J. (2002). Is kinship always already heterosexual? *Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 13(1), 14-44.

Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. Boca Raton, Florida: Routledge.

Campbell, J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*, 359(9314), 1331-1336.

Campbell, J., Garcia-Moreno, C., & Sharps, P. (2004). Abuse during pregnancy in industrialized and developing countries. *Violence against women*, 10(7), 770-789.

Campbell, R., & Wasco, S. M. (2000). Feminist approaches to social science: Epistemological and methodological tenets. *American journal of community psychology*, 28(6), 773-791.

Cantalupo, N., Martin, L.V., Pak, K. & Shin, S. (2006). Domestic Violence in Ghana: The Open Secret. *The Georgetown Journal of Gender and the Law*, 2, 531- 597.

Carroll, K. E. (2009). Outsider, insider, alongsider: Examining reflexivity in hospital-based video research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(3), 246-263.

Carsten, J. (1999). The heat of the hearth: the process of kinship in a Malay fishing community. *Akademika*, 54.

Charles, N., & Hughes-Freeland, F. (2013). *Practising feminism: Identity, difference, power*. Hoboken: Routledge.

Cleves, M., Gould, W., & Gutierrez, R. (2008). *An introduction to survival analysis using Stata*. College Station: Stata Press.

Coker-Appiah, D. & Cusack, K. (1999). *Breaking the silence and challenging the myths of violence against women and children in Ghana: report on a national study of violence*. Accra: Gender Studies & Human Rights Centre.

Collier, J. F., & Yanagisako, S. J. (Eds.). (1987). *Gender and kinship: Essays toward a unified analysis*. Redwood City: Stanford University Press.

Cramer, E. P., & Plummer, S. (2009). People of color with disabilities: Intersectionality as a framework for analyzing intimate partner violence in social, historical, and political contexts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 18(2), 162-181.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *U. Chi. Legal F.*, 139.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford law review*, 1241-1299.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

D'Cruze, S., & Rao, A. (2005). *Violence, Vulnerability and Embodiment: Gender and History*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

Deutsch, N. L. (2004). Positionality and the pen: Reflections on the process of becoming a feminist researcher and writer. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(6), 885-902.

Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y., Bacchus, L. J., Child, J. C., Falder, G., Petzold, M., ... & Watts, C. H. (2013). *Intimate partner violence and incident depressive symptoms and suicide attempts: a systematic review of longitudinal studies*. Cambridge: PLoS medicine.

Dolan, C. S. (2001). The 'good wife': Struggles over resources in the Kenyan horticultural sector. *Journal of Development Studies*, 37(3), 39-70.

Domestic Violence Act, c.732 GHANA. (2007).

Doucet, A., & Mauthner, N. (2002). Knowing responsibly: Ethics, feminist epistemologies and methodologies. *Ethics in qualitative research*, 123-145.

Dragiewicz, M., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2012). Claims About Women's Use of Non-fatal Force in Intimate Relationships: A Contextual Review of Canadian Research. *Violence Against Women*, 18(9), 1008-1026.

Dunkle, K. L., Jewkes, R. K., Brown, H. C., Gray, G. E., McIntyre, J. A., & Harlow, S. D. (2004). Gender-based violence, relationship power, and risk of HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa. *The Lancet*, 363 (9419), 1415-1421

Duran, J. (2001). *Worlds of knowing: Global feminist epistemologies*. New York: Routledge.

Edleson, J. L. (1999). Children's witnessing of adult domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(8), 839-870.

Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2008). Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: An observational study. *The Lancet*, 371 (9619), 1165-1172.

Emenike, E., Lawoko, S., & Dalal, K. (2008). Intimate partner violence and reproductive health of women in Kenya. *International Nursing Review*, 55(1), 97-102.

Franklin, S., & McKinnon, S. (2001). *Relative values: Reconfiguring kinship studies*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy and public policy. *Signs*, 30(4), 2211-2236.

Fox, J. (1997). *Applied regression analysis, linear models, and related methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Frieze, I. H. (2005). Female violence against intimate partners: An introduction. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(3), 229-237.

Gannon, L. (1999). *Women and aging: Transcending the myths*. London: Routledge.

Garcia-Moreno, C. et al. (2005). *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses*. Geneva: Switzerland.

Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, Henrica A F M, Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., Watts, C. H. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *Lancet*, 368(9543), 1260-1269.

Gass, J. D., Stein, D. J., Williams, D. R., & Seedat, S. (2011). Gender differences in risk for intimate partner violence among South African adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(14), 2764-2789.

Ghana News Agency. (2010, June 3). 109,784 cases of domestic violence recorded from the office Domestic Violence and Victims Support Unit.

Ghana News Agency. (2014, January 29). 770 Wives Beat Husbands-In Just One Year.

Ghana Police Service. (2008). The Establishment of WAJU (Women and Juvenile Unit) now DOVVSU (Domestic violence and Victims Support Unit).

Ghana Statistical Service (2012). *Population and Housing Census, 2010*. Accra: Ghana.

Ghana Statistical Service (2009). *Ghana demographic and health survey, 2008*. Accra: Ghana.

Gocking, R. (2005). *The History of Ghana*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Goicolea, I., Öhman, A., Salazar Torres, M., Morrás, I., & Edin, K. (2012). Condemning violence without rejecting sexism? Exploring how young men understand intimate partner violence in Ecuador. *Global Health Action*, 5, 1-12.

Government of Ghana (2014). *Ten Regions of Ghana*. Retrieved April 25, 2014, from <http://www.ghana.gov.gh/index.php/about-ghana/regions>

Harding, S. G. (2004). *The feminist standpoint theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies*. East Sussex: Psychology Press.

Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies: An introduction. *Signs*, 30(4), 2009-2015.

Harnois, Catherine E. (2013). *Feminist measures in survey research*. Los Angeles California: Sage.

Hearn, J. (2013). The sociological significance of domestic violence: Tensions, paradoxes and implications. *Current Sociology*, 61(2), 152-170.

- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Carter, G. L. (2000). *Working women in America: Split dreams*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hesse-Biber, S. N., & Leavy, P. (2007). *Feminist Research Practice: A Primer*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hester, M. (1992). *Lewd women and wicked witches: A study of the dynamics of male domination*. New York: Routledge.
- Ilika, A. L. (2006). Women's perception of partner violence in a rural Igbo community. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 9(3), 77-88.
- International Center for Research on Women. (2009). *Intimate Partner Violence: High cost to households and communities*. United Nations Population Fund publication.
- Jaggar, A. M. (2008). *Just methods: An interdisciplinary feminist reader*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *The Lancet*, 359(9315), 1423-1429.
- Jewkes, R., Levin, J., & Penn-Kekana, L. (2002). Risk factors for domestic violence: Findings from a South African cross-sectional study. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 55(9), 1603-1617
- Jiang, X. (2005). Feminist Epistemology: An Introduction. *Academic Perspectives*, 1, 56-58.
- Johnson, H., Ollus, N., & Nevala, S. (2007). *Violence against women: An international perspective*. New York: Springer.
- Johnson, M. P. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 289-296.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62(4), 948-963.
- Jolliffe, I. T. (2002). *Principal component analysis*. New York: Springer.
- Karim, V. (2011). Domestic Violence in Ghana. *A Feminist Magazine at Yale* 7, 1-4.
- Kaye, D. K., Mirembe, F., Ekstrom, A. M., Kyomuhendo, G. B., & Johansson, A. (2006). Implications of bride price on domestic violence and reproductive health in Wakiso district, Uganda. *African Health Sciences*, 5(4), 300-303.

- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). Gender Symmetry" in Domestic Violence: A Substantive and Methodological Research Review. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1332-1363.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2011). *The gendered society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Aronson, A. (2008). *The gendered society reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M. A. (2010). *Men's lives*. Boston, Mass: Allyn & Bacon.
- King, R. (2006). Is it time for a progress report on violence against women in Ghana? *Human Rights Review*, 7(2), 75-97.
- Kishor, S. & Johnson, K. (2004). *Profiling Domestic Violence: A Multi Country study*. Calverton: ORG Macro publication.
- Kishor, S. (2012). Married Women's risk of STIs in developing countries: The role of intimate partner violence and Partner's infection status. *Violence Against Women*, 18(7), 829-853.
- Kishor, S. and Johnson, K. (2006). Reproductive health and domestic violence: Are the poorest women uniquely disadvantaged? *Demography*, 43(2): 293-307.
- Kiss, L., Schraiber, L.B., Heise, L., Zimmerman, C., Gouveia, N & Watts, C. (2012). Gender-based violence and socio-economic inequalities: Does living in more deprived neighborhoods increase women's risk of intimate partner violence? *Social Science & Medicine*, 74, 1172-1179.
- Kitzmann, K. M., Gaylord, N. K., Holt, A. R., & Kenny, E. D. (2003). Child witnesses to domestic violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(2), 339-352.
- Koenig, M. A., Ahmed, S., Hossain, M. B., & Mozumder, A. K. A. (2003). Women's status and domestic violence in rural Bangladesh: individual-and community-level effects. *Demography*, 40(2), 269-288.
- Koenig, M. A., et al. (2003). Domestic violence in rural Uganda: Evidence from a community-based study. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 81(1), 53-60.
- Konadu, K. (2010). *The Akan diaspora in the Americas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krantz, G., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2005). Violence against women. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(10), 818-821.

- Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The World Report on Violence and Health. *Lancet*, 360(9339), 1083-1088.
- Kutsoati, E., & Morck, R. (2012). Family Ties, Inheritance Rights, and Successful Poverty Alleviation: Evidence from Ghana. National Bureau of Economic Research. Working Paper No. 18080.
- La Ferrara, E. (2007). Descent rules and strategic transfers. Evidence from matrilineal groups in Ghana. *Journal of Development Economics*, 83(2), 280-301.
- Laurie, T., & Stark, H. (2012). *Reconsidering kinship: Beyond the nuclear family with Deleuze and Guattari*. Victoria, Carleton: Melbourne University Publishing.
- Letherby, G. (2003). *Feminist research in theory and practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill International.
- Linos, N., Slopen, N., Subramanian, S. V., Berkman, L., & Kawachi, I. (2013). Influence of community social norms on spousal violence: A population-based multilevel study of Nigerian women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(1), 148-155.
- Lloyd, S. A., Few, A. L., & Allen, K. R. (2009). *Handbook of Feminist Family studies*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist studies: A guide to intersectional theory, methodology and writing*. New York: Routledge
- MacKinnon, C. A. (2006). *Are Women Human?* Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Mann, J. R., & Takyi, B. K. (2009). Autonomy, Dependence or Culture: Examining the impact of resources and socio-cultural processes on attitudes towards intimate partner violence in Ghana, Africa. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(5), 323-335.
- Manuh, T. (1997). Wives, children, and intestate succession in Ghana. *African feminism and the politics of survival in Sub-Saharan Africa*, 77-95.
- Manuh, T. (2007). *The passage of domestic violence legislation in Ghana*. Retrieved January 17, 2014, from <http://www.research4development.info/PDF/Outputs/WomenEmp/GhanaDV.pdf>.
- McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs*, 30(3), 1771-1800.
- McClennen, J. C. (2005). Domestic violence between same-gender partners recent findings and future research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(2), 149-154.

- 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.
- McPhail, B. A., Busch, N. B., Kulkarni, S., & Rice, G. (2007). An Integrative Feminist Model: The Evolving Feminist Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 13(8), 817-841.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Minkah-Premo, S. (2001). *Coping with violence against women*. Ghana, Accra: Asempa Publishers.
- Moe, A. M. (2009). Battered women, children, and the end of abusive relationships. *Affilia*, 24(3), 244-256.
- Mohr, J. W., & White, H. C. (2008). How to model an institution. *Theory and Society*, 37(5), 485-512.
- Myers, K. A., Anderson, C. D., & Risman, B. J. (1998). *Feminist Foundations: Toward Transforming Sociology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Naples, N. A. (2003). *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse analysis, and activist research*. New York: Routledge.
- Nicholls, R. (2009). Research and Indigenous participation: critical reflexive methods. *International journal of social research methodology*, 12(2), 117-126.
- Nukunya, G. K. (2003). *Tradition and Change: Case of the Family*. Accra: Ghana University Press.
- Obi, S. N., & Ozumba, B. C. (2007). Factors associated with domestic violence in south-east Nigeria. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology: The Journal of the Institute of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 27(1), 75-75.
- Odimegwu, C. O. (2001): Couple formation and domestic violence among the TIV of Benue. 1-42.
- Ofei-Aboagye, R. O. (1994). Altering the strands of the fabric: A preliminary look at domestic violence in Ghana. *Signs*, 924-938.
- Ofori, E. (2010). *Cultural Storytelling and Oral Tradition*. Retrieved May 11, 2013, from <http://www.united church.ca/files/intercultural/storytelling.pdf>

Okereke, G. O. (2006). Violence against women in Africa. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies*, 2(1), 1-35.

Oksala, J. (2012). *Foucault, Politics, and Violence*. Evaston: Northwestern University Press.

Oladebo, O., Yusuf, O.B and Arulogun, O.S. (2011). Factors influencing gender based violence among men and women in selected states in Nigeria. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 15(4): 78-86.

Oppong, C. (2001). A Note on Matriliny and Marriage in Accra. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 7(3), 211-218.

Osam, S. (2004). *Violence against women in Ghana: An analysis of Cases Presented in the Print Media*. Accra: Abantu for Development.

Owusu, S.A. (2012). *Five Cows for a Wife? Ghana Marriage Customs in a Limbo!* Retrieved February 13, 2014, from <http://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/NewsArchive/artikel.php?ID=238494>

Pager, D., & Shepherd, H. (2008). The sociology of discrimination: Racial discrimination in employment, housing, credit, and consumer markets. *Annual review of sociology*, 34, 181.

Pallitto, C. C., & O'Campo, P. (2005). Community level effects of gender inequality on intimate partner violence and unintended pregnancy in Colombia: Testing the feminist perspective. *Social Science & Medicine* (1982), 60(10), 2205-2216.

Pallitto, C. C., Campbell, J. C., & O'Campo, P. (2005). Is intimate partner violence associated with unintended pregnancy? A review of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 6(3), 217-235.

Panda, P., & Agarwal, B. (2005). Marital violence, human development and women's property status in India. *World Development*, 33(5), 823-850.

Pandey, G.K., Dutt, D and Banerjee, B. (2009). Partner and relationship factors in domestic violence: Perspectives of women from a slum in Calcutta, India. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24: 1175-1191.

Population and housing census: national analytical report (2010). Retrieved May 22, 2014, from http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/docfiles/2010phc/National_Analytical_Report.pdf

Price, L. (2005). *Feminist Frameworks: Building Theory on Violence Against Women*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Ramazanoglu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Read, D. W. (2001). Formal analysis of kinship terminologies and its relationship to what constitutes kinship. *Anthropological theory*, 1(2), 239-267.

Rennison, C. M. (2001). *Intimate partner violence and age of victim, 1993-99*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Risman, B. J. (2001). Calling the bluff of value-free science. *American Sociological Review*, 66(4), 605-610.

Schilt, Kristen, and Laurel Westbrook. (2009). Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity "Gender Normals," Transgender People, and the Social Maintenance of Heterosexuality. *Gender & Society*, 23(4) 440-464.

Sen, P. (1999). Enhancing women's choices in responding to domestic violence in Calcutta: A comparison of employment and education. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 11(2), 65-86.

Shivji, I. G. (2008). *Pan-Africanism Or Pragmatism?* Tanzania, Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Shope, J. H. (2006). You can't cross a river without getting wet: A feminist standpoint on the dilemmas of cross-cultural research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(1), 163-184.

Simister, J. G. (2010). Domestic violence and female genital mutilation in Kenya: Effects of ethnicity and education. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(3), 247-257.

Skinner, T., Hester, M., & Malos, E. (2005). *Researching Gender Violence: Feminist methodology in action*. Cullompton: Willan.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women*, 11(1), 38-64.

Soler, H., Vinayak, P., & Quadagno, D. (2000). Biosocial aspects of domestic violence. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 25(7), 721-739.

Sotirin, P., & Ellingson, L.L. (2007). *Rearticulating the aunt: Feminist alternatives of family, care, and kinship in popular performances of aunting* (2007). Los Angeles: Sage.

Sternberg, K. J., et al. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(1), 44-52.

Stone, L. (1997). *Kinship and gender: An introduction*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Strid, S., Walby, S., & Armstrong, J. (2013). Intersectionality and multiple inequalities: Visibility in British policy on violence against women. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society*, 20(4), 558-581.

Stuart, J. (1994). "Patriarchy" Reconsidered. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 2(4), 309-324.

Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2002). A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8(3), 286-319.

Swart, L., Seedat M., Stevens G., & Ricardo I. (2002). Violence in adolescents' romantic relationships: Findings from a survey amongst school-going youth in a South African community. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25(4), 385-385.

Takyi, B. K., & Dodoo, F. N. (2005). Gender, lineage, and fertility-related outcomes in Ghana. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67(1), 251-257.

Takyi, B. K., & Gyimah, S. O. (2007). Matrilineal family ties and marital dissolution in Ghana. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(5), 682-705.

Tenkorang, E. Y., & Owusu, G. (2010). Correlates of HIV/AIDS testing in Ghana: some evidence from the demographic and health surveys. *AIDS Care*, 22, 296-307.

Tenkorang, E. Y., & Owusu, Y. A. (2013). Coerced first sexual intercourse among women in Ghana: Evidence from the demographic and health survey. *Sexuality & Culture*, 17(1), 167-184.

Tenkorang, E. Y., Owusu, A. Y., Yeboah, E. H., & Bannerman, R. (2013). Factors influencing domestic and marital violence against women in Ghana. *Journal of Family Violence*, 28(8), 771-781.

Terry, G., and Hoare, J. (2007). *Gender-based Violence*. Oxford: Oxfam.

Tickner, A. J. (2001). Patriarchy. In Jones, R. J. B. (eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of International Political Economy*. New York: Routledge.

Turner, J. H. (1997). *The institutional order: Economy, kinship, religion, polity, law, and education in evolutionary and comparative perspective*. New York: Longman.

United Nations (1993). Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women, A/RES/48/104. Retrieved on January 18, 2014, from <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/48/a48r104.htm>

United Nations (2011). Human Development Report. Retrieved on February 2, 2014, from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/HDR/2011%20Global%20HDR/English/HDR_2011_EN_Chapter2.pdf

Uthman, O. A., Lawoko, S., & Moradi, T. (2009). Factors associated with attitudes towards intimate partner violence against women: A comparative analysis of 17 sub-Saharan countries. *BMC International Health and Human Rights*, 9(1), 14-14.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(5), 997.

Vyas, S., & Watts, C. (2009). How does economic empowerment affect women's risk of intimate partner violence in low and middle income countries? A systematic review of published evidence. *Journal of International Development*, 21(5), 577-602.

Watts, C., & Zimmerman, C. (2002). Violence against women: Global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet*, 359(9313), 1232-1237.

Wickramasinghe, M. (2009). *Feminist research methodology: making meanings of meaning-making*. New York: Routledge.

Williamson, E. (2010). Living in the world of the domestic violence perpetrator: Negotiating the unreality of coercive control. *Violence Against Women*, 16(12), 1412-1423.

World Health Organization & Pan American Health Organization (2012). Understanding and addressing violence against women: Intimate Partner Violence. Paper No. WHO/RHR/12.36.

World Health Organization (2013). *Global and Regional Estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. Geneva: Switzerland.

World Health Organization. (2001). *Putting women first: Ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women*. Geneva: Department of Gender and Women's Health, WHO.

Yoder, J. D., & Kahn, A. S. (1992). Toward a feminist understanding of women and power. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16(4), 381-388.

Zakar, R., Zakar, M. Z., & Kraemer, A. (2013). Men's Beliefs and Attitudes toward Intimate Partner Violence against Women in Pakistan. *Violence against women*, 19(2), 246-268.

Zuberi, T. (2001). *Thicker than blood: How racial statistics lie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

APPENDIX

Table 1: A univariate distribution of selected dependent and independent variables		
Variables	Matrilineal (N=810)	Patrilineal (N=1014)
Physical violence	-.0254	.0210
Sexual violence	-.0433	.0350
Emotional violence	.0052	-.0039
Education		
No Education	10.7	48.5
Primary Education	25.2	21.2
Secondary Education	60.7	27.2
Higher Education	3.3	3.1
Wealth status		
Poorest	6.8	38.3
Poorer	20.6	19.6
Middle	24.0	14.1
Richer	25.8	14.5
Richest	22.8	13.5
Employment status		
Not Employed	9.0	12.6
Employed	91.0	87.4
Mean score for wifebeating	-.0831	.0705
Mean score for husband controls	-.0191	-.0083
Respondent's father ever beat mother		
No	81.3	81.1
Yes	12.2	13.0
Don't Know	6.5	5.8
Husband drinks alcohol		
No	62.6	61.4
Yes	37.4	38.6
Religion		
Christians	92.5	58.2
Moslems	2.8	27.2
Traditionalists	1.0	9.7
No religion	3.6	4.9
Type of place of residence		
Urban	45.5	33.4
Rural	55.5	66.6
Region of residence		
Greater Accra	11.1	12.3
Central	14.8	1.5
Western	18.2	3.5
Volta	.70	16.0
Eastern	11.7	7.6
Ashanti	28.6	5.8
Brong Ahafo	14.1	6.5
Northern	.70	46.9
Mean age of respondent	33.2	32.3

Table 2: Zero-order OLS Coefficients for physical and sexual violence among women aged 15-49

	Physical abuse		Sexual abuse		Emotional violence	
Variables	Matrilineal	Patrilineal	Matrilineal	Patrilineal	Matrilineal	Patrilineal
Education	β	β	β	β	β	β
No Education	0	0	0	0	0	0
Primary Education	.049 (.127)	.047 (.092)	.137 (.069)**	.206 (.098)**	.176 (.119)	.078 (.087)
Secondary Education	-.095 (.112)	-.080 (.076)	.179 (.057)**	.156 (.083)*	.074 (.110)	.004 (.082)
Higher Education	-.208 (.203)	-.232 (.164)	.271 (.225)	-.136 (.048)**	-.169 (.185)	-.394 (.087)***
Wealth status						
Poorest	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poorer	-.211 (.187)	-.058 (.094)	-.047 (.155)	.141 (.102)	-.375 (.177)*	.014 (.099)
Middle	-.168 (.189)	-.031 (.109)	-.029 (.154)	.015 (.110)	-.222 (.194)	-.012 (.105)
Richer	-.179 (.185)	.045 (.108)	-.075 (.147)	.064 (.112)	-.206 (.186)	.103 (.110)
Richest	-.157 (.192)	-.062 (.056)	-.050 (.149)	-.004 (.091)	-.350 (.185)*	-.079 (.097)
Employment status						
Not Employed	0	0	0	0	0	0
Employed	.101 (.092)	.003 (.104)	.012 (.092)	.142 (.115)	-.016 (.112)	.125 (.089)
wifebeating justified	.074 (.0360)**	.102 (.038)***	-.006 (.029)	.084 (.040)**	.093 (.037)**	.121 (.034)***
Husband controls	.341 (.070)***	.346 (.061)***	.070 (.055)	.265 (.063)***	.493 (.089)**	.458 (.050)***
Respondent's father ever beat mother						
No	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	.197 (.119)*	.413 (.141)***	.256 (.148)*	.425 (.147)**	.223 (.123)*	.289 (.114)***
Don't Know	.188 (.149)	-.029 (.123)	-.142 (.056)**	-.116 (.056)**	.178 (.174)	-.036 (.156)
Husband drinks alcohol						
No	0	0	0	0	0	0
Yes	.406 (.075)***	.274 (.073)***	.141 (.071)**	.269 (.081)**	.595 (.080)**	.257 (.068)***
Religion						
Christians	0	0	0	0	0	0
Moslems	-.251 (.143)*	-.001 (.080)	.204 (.267)	-.151 (.073)**	-.354 (.125)*	.168 (.078)**
Traditionalists	.196 (.295)	.044 (.120)	-.234 (.075)**	.064 (.146)	.423 (.430)	-.082 (.112)
No religion	.444 (.322)	-.130 (.110)	.303 (.270)	.062 (.154)	.032 (.194)	.137 (.183)
Type of place of residence						
Urban	0	0	0	0	0	0
Rural	-.072 (.068)	-.136 (.076)	-.025 (.063)	.053 (.079)	.073 (.073)	-.097 (.080)
Region of residence						
Greater Accra	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central	.032 (.166)	.029 (.298)	.002 (.090)	.328 (.427)	.087 (.151)	.058 (.371)
Western	-.239 (.146)	-.180 (.149)	.176 (.115)	-.131 (.112)	-.144 (.131)	-.180 (.204)
Volta	.456 (.632)	-.162 (.139)	-.204 (.140)	.191 (.152)	.228 (.422)	-.164 (.132)
Eastern	-.167 (.149)	-.205 (.133)	.047 (.084)	.063 (.164)	-.115 (.148)	-.131 (.156)
Ashanti	.066 (.147)	-.240 (.140)	.010 (.068)	-.061 (.142)	.211 (.127)	-.193 (.160)
Brong Ahafo	-.022 (.162)	-.235 (.137)	.253 (.126)**	-.123 (.135)	.150 (.158)	-.147 (.163)
Northern	-.240 (.154)	-.010 (.121)	-.079 (.061)	-.021 (.097)	-.328 (.159)*	.019 (.119)
Age of respondent	.001 (.004)	.006 (.004)	-.003 (.004)	-.001 (.004)	-.002 (.004)	.004 (.004)

Note: *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01; robust standard errors are in brackets.

Table 3: Multivariate OLS Coefficients for physical violence among women aged 15-49				
	Matrilineal		Patrilineal	
Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Education	β	β	β	β
No Education		0		0
Primary Education		-.030 (.114)		.007 (.098)
Secondary Education		-.129 (.113)		-.080 (.088)
Higher Education		-.200 (.253)		-.125 (.197)
Wealth status				
Poorest		0		0
Poorer		-.159 (.167)		-.052 (.089)
Middle		-.141 (.163)		-.106 (.117)
Richer		-.147 (.166)		-.090 (.128)
Richest		-.141 (.186)		-.197 (.136)
Employment status				
Not Employed		0		0
Employed		.205 (.113)		.016 (.114)
Wifebeating justified	.040 (.035)	.037 (.038)	.048 (.037)	.041 (.037)
Husband controls	.289 (.066)***	.291 (.067)*	.304 (.058)***	.307 (.060)***
Respondent's father ever beat mother				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.084 (.115)	.091 (.117)	.292 (.133)**	.284 (.132)**
Don't Know	.142 (.129)	.144 (.126)	-.041 (.116)	-.035 (.177)
Husband drinks alcohol				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.296 (.068)***	.285 (.070)*	.239 (.068)***	.233 (.069)***
Religion				
Christians	0	0	0	0
Moslems	-.117 (.195)	-.131 (.158)	-.018 (.079)	-.034 (.087)
Traditionalists	.120 (.336)	.109 (.295)	-.023 (.127)	-.070 (.126)
No religion	.304 (.172)	.274 (.309)	-.092 (.113)	-.182 (.118)
Type of place of residence				
Urban	0	0	0	0
Rural	-.044 (.065)	-.094 (.081)	-.187 (.083)**	-.266 (.107)***
Region of residence				
Greater Accra	0	0	0	0
Central	-.010 (.172)	-.045 (.176)	.172 (.289)	.134 (.266)
Western	-.153 (.147)	-.211 (.152)	.076 (.145)	-.023 (.144)
Volta	.343 (.612)	.288 (.564)	-.037 (.143)	-.097 (.143)
Eastern	-.118 (.153)	-.132 (.158)	-.039 (.132)	-.130 (.130)
Ashanti	.019 (.160)	.006 (.164)	-.117 (.136)	-.190 (.135)
Brong Ahafo	-.013 (.164)	-.069 (.167)	-.070 (.137)	-.164 (.140)
Northern	-.142 (.194)	-.203 (.203)	.051 (.134)	-.049 (.128)
Age of respondent	.004 (.003)	.002 (.004)	.010 (.004)	.006 (.005)
R-squared	.123	.133	.110	.116
Model significance	4.09 (17)***	2.90 (25)***	3.44 (17)***	2.83 (25)
Number of observations	811	811	1014	1014
Note: *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01; robust standard errors are in brackets.				

Table 4: Multivariate OLS Coefficients for sexual violence among women aged 15-49				
	Matrilineal		Patrilineal	
Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Education	β	β	β	β
No Education		0		0
Primary Education		.168 (.079)**		.139 (.106)
Secondary Education		.254 (.0780***)		.128 (.097)
Higher Education		.452 (.275)		.037 (.114)
Wealth status				
Poorest		0		0
Poorer		-.048 (.168)		.145 (.110)
Middle		-.066 (.158)		.002 (.125)
Richer		-.114 (.157)		.074 (.186)
Richest		-.084 (.174)		.050 (.160)
Employment status				
Not Employed		0		0
Employed		.029 (.099)		.182 (.124)
Wifebeating	-.006 (.031)	.001 (.033)	.059 (.040)	.062 (.041)
Husband controls	.046 (.060)	.044 (.059)	.244 (.061)**	.241 (.062)***
Respondent's father ever beat mother				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.233 (.146)	.242 (.149)	.351 (.138)**	.362 (.140)***
Don't Know	-.128 (.059)**	-.109 (.059)	-.060 (.057)	-.040 (.059)
Husband drinks alcohol				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.137 (.075)*	.145 (.076)**	.175 (.074)**	.161 (.077)**
Religion				
Christians	0	0	0	0
Moslems	.152 (.242)	.154 (.234)	-.066 (.077)	-.036 (.085)
Traditionalists	-.217 (.127)*	-.198 (.170)	.044 (.144)	.099 (.149)
No religion	.287 (.258)	.317 (.262)	.090 (.142)	.185 (.146)
Type of place of residence				
Urban	0	0	0	0
Rural	-.046 (.073)	-.028 (.072)	-.001 (.102)	.029 (.138)
Region of residence				
Greater Accra	0	0	0	0
Central	.013 (.097)	.044 (.103)	.338 (.427)	.331 (.410)
Western	.203 (.134)	.232 (.142)	-.031 (.143)	-.046 (.154)
Volta	-.160 (.165)	-.203 (.173)	.195 (.166)	.190 (.158)
Eastern	.110 (.097)	.112 (.104)	.118 (.179)	.106 (.179)
Ashanti	.012 (.080)	.009 (.085)	-.030 (.138)	-.020 (.135)
Brong Ahafo	.244 (.129)*	.269 (.135)**	-.104 (.143)	-.047 (.148)
Northern	-.032 (.106)	.007 (.144)	-.086 (.124)	-.031 (.117)
Age of respondent	-.002 (.004)	-.002 (.004)	-.002 (.004)	-.002 (.004)
R-squared	.0377	.0467	.0772	.0859
Model significance	1.62 (17)**	1.07 (25)	2.14 (17)***	1.71 (25)**
Number of observations	811	811	1014	1014

Note: *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01; robust standard errors are in brackets.

Table 5: Multivariate OLS Coefficients for Emotional violence among women aged 15-49

Variables	Matrilineal		Patrilineal	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Education	β	β	β	β
No Education		0		0
Primary Education		.162 (.110)		.045 (.089)
Secondary Education		.093 (.110)		.051 (.091)
Higher Education		.058 (.214)		-.165 (.114)
Wealth status				
Poorest		0		0
Poorer		-.382 (.156)***		.022 (.095)
Middle		-.202 (.170)		-.068 (.110)
Richer		-.113 (.171)		-.029 (.136)
Richest		-.225 (.191)		-.165 (.114)
Employment status				
Not Employed		0		0
Employed		.049 (.106)		.221 (.091)***
Wifebeating	.033 (.035)	.041 (.036)	.043 (.033)	.037 (.033)
Husband controls	.431 (.084)***	.433 (.085)***	.418 (.049)***	.424 (.049)***
Respondent's father ever beat mother				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.055 (.110)	.037 (.111)	.153 (.107)	.153 (.109)
Don't Know	.193 (.131)	.188 (.128)	.019 (.131)	.042 (.132)
Husband drinks alcohol				
No	0	0	0	0
Yes	.455 (.078)***	.433 (.085)***	.288 (.066)***	.274 (.067)***
Religion				
Christians	0	0	0	0
Moslems	-.180 (.140)	-.158 (.141)	.186 (.078)***	.203 (.082)***
Traditionalists	.359 (.368)	.369 (.337)	-.150 (.112)	-.155 (.112)
No religion	-.179 (.175)	-.201 (.181)	.151 (.172)	.126 (.156)
Type of place of residence				
Urban	0	0	0	0
Rural	.111 (.066)	.140 (.083)	-.090 (.088)	-.142 (.116)
Region of residence				
Greater Accra	0	0	0	0
Central	-.033 (.151)	-.031 (.161)	.165 (.340)	.118 (.322)
Western	-.105 (.124)	-.113 (.133)	.024 (.165)	-.092 (.171)
Volta	-.052 (.359)	-.114 (.355)	-.073 (.126)	-.149 (.131)
Eastern	-.151 (.137)	-.170 (.146)	-.014 (.151)	-.101 (.152)
Ashanti	.100 (.134)	.090 (.140)	-.159 (.142)	-.235 (.149)
Brong Ahafo	.115 (.161)	.091 (.168)	-.072 (.150)	-.138 (.158)
Northern	-.352 (.197)	-.409 (.213)	-.026 (.123)	-.100 (.127)
Age of respondent	.003 (.004)	.003 (.004)	.004 (.004)	.004 (.004)
R-squared	.220	.232	.171	.182
Model significance	7.26 (17)***	6.39 (25)***	7.82 (17)***	6.40 (25)***
Number of observations	811	811	1014	1014

Note: *p<.1; **p<.05; ***p<.01; robust standard errors are in brackets.