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Abstract: Domestic violence against women is an undesirable phenomenon occurring in all societies. Although the forms and manifestations of domestic violence vary across different cultures, this type of violence, encompassing physical, psychological, financial, and sexual dimensions, inflicts serious harm upon women. The aim of this research is to examine the relationship between social activism and social responsibility of women in preventing domestic violence. The social activism and social responsibility of women in preventing domestic violence are complex and multifaceted. These two concepts mutually influence each other in two ways: on one hand, society and culture, as influencing factors, shape the roles, expectations, and values of the community, impacting individuals’ behaviors and decision-making; on the other hand, social responsibility involves a commitment to fulfilling social and ethical duties that assist individuals and society in safeguarding individuals’ rights and preventing social harm. This research, conducted through a survey and in a descriptive and analytical manner, provides important findings from statistical analyses in the areas of domestic violence, social interaction, and responsibility. The results indicate a significant and inverse relationship between domestic violence and the variables of social interaction and responsibility. In other words, as social interaction and responsibility increase, the level of domestic violence decreases.
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1. Introduction

Violence against women in the family is the most common form of violence, often perpetrated by close family members such as husbands (Amiri, 2019). Its prevalence varies in different parts of the world. It is estimated that violence exists in more than half of the families, with one in four women experiencing violence. Almost one-third of women worldwide have experienced violence at least once (Amiri, 2019). To prevent and control this problem, it is essential to address the root causes. In the initial stage, raising awareness and changing the public attitude towards the real position and situation of women in society, eliminating discrimination at various stages of life, improving literacy levels, promoting employment, and consequently, fighting poverty are necessary.

Since women’s education is one of the factors and subsets of social interaction for women, increasing women’s higher education reduces domestic violence. Women with university education have greater ability to control domestic violence. This aspect is crucial for resolving family conflicts without creating tension and violence. Additionally, the promotion of women’s education enhances their sense of effectiveness and efficiency. Women with a sense of effectiveness gain more self-confidence and participate more in social activities. This participation includes voluntary collaboration in local projects, involvement in local or city council elections, willingness to run for city council elections, and membership in groups and associations.

Social action is one of the main axes of theory and research in the social sciences. Actors
attribute meanings to their behaviors, and these meanings influence their actions. Max Weber divides social action into four groups based on the motives and specific goals of the actors. The characteristics of diverse societies in different periods result in various forms of action (Rastegar Khalid, 2012).

Today, components and manifestations of social action derived from social media are based on the function of social mobilization, which is perceived as one of the important functions of mass media. Due to the close relationship with the nature of social media, it surpasses the importance of other social media functions (Khianiki & Basirian Jahromi, 2013).

Therefore, domestic violence is a form of violence that occurs within the home environment and is perpetrated by close family members, including spouses, fathers, brothers, and even children. Various factors contribute to the occurrence of domestic violence against women. One such factor that increases domestic violence is legal factors, including ambiguities and deficiencies in laws such as the right to divorce, inequality in the amount of blood money (diyah1), homicide, and custody of children, as well as the unequal credibility of testimony between men and women. In Islamic societies and governments, these legal factors contribute to the creation of a misguided mentality among the public.

On the other hand, social factors also play a significant role in the increase of domestic violence. As we know, the family is one of the most important and stable social institutions responsible for nurturing children and future generations, reflecting the entire functioning and behaviors of individuals. Proper upbringing of children can contribute to a healthier society. Children who witness and learn violence can become aggressive individuals. Parents should not differentiate between their children based on gender, as this approach can lead to the early formation of patriarchal attitudes, reinforcing the notion of male superiority, which in turn contributes to various forms of violence.

The way girls and boys are treated should not differ; in some families, there is not much reaction to the wrongdoings of boys, and it is dealt with in a way that justifies the male’s right because of his gender. Conversely, if a mistake is made by a daughter, it is met with severe punishment and reprimand. Therefore, by understanding and treating children equally, creating a joyful and peaceful environment in the family, respecting the rights of both parties, avoiding gender-based differences, not giving absolute authority to male children, respecting each other, and so on, we can witness a healthy family.

If job opportunities and power are distributed equally and fairly between women and men, both genders will contribute to the social acceptance of women in society by men.

This article aims to examine the impact of social interactions and responsibility on domestic violence against women in the Panj Tan region of Mashhad through the lens of prevailing relationships in families. The main objective is to assess the prevalence of domestic violence against women in families in the Panj Tan region of Mashhad and investigate the relationship between social interaction and its components (i.e., political participation, scientific engagement, social capital, and social media) and responsibility with its components (feeling of competence, sense of effectiveness, responsible action, and sense of duty) and domestic violence.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1. Domestic Violence

The family is the first and most stable social institution where individual identity and societal acceptance are formed, and the acceptance of social values and norms has led to the transfer of relationship patterns and interactions to other social institutions (Khani et al., 2010). The function of the family is not only to provide for the physical, material, and psychological needs and create a warm and intimate space for its members, but it can also have destructive functions such as violence (Shadmani, 2017). Violence against women occurs in both private and public spheres, threatening the health and security of the family. Women are the educators of healthy individuals, so neglecting women’s health and perpetrating domestic violence against women is an Islamic law, and according to jurisprudential definitions, it refers to the compensation, usually in the form of money or property, paid to someone who has suffered injury or the heirs of a person killed due to intentional harm or manslaughter. In legal terms, “Diyeh” is the monetary penalty collected from the perpetrator for the benefit of the victim or their legal representatives, and the amount is determined by the Shari’a court for the committed crime.

1 “Diyeh” or blood money is an Islamic law, and according to jurisprudential definitions, it refers to the compensation, usually in the form of money or property, paid to someone who has suffered injury or the heirs of a person killed due to intentional harm or manslaughter. In legal terms, “Diyeh” is the monetary penalty collected from the perpetrator for the benefit of the victim or their legal representatives, and the amount is determined by the Shari’a court for the committed crime.
violence against them can lead to various mental and even physical illnesses (Khani et al., 2010). Physical harm to women can have numerous consequences, including disruptions in the role of women as mothers and wives, psychological and mental consequences such as boredom and depression, neglect of children, and more. This can pose a threat to the health of family members and, consequently, society, to the extent that no society can claim to be healthy if it lacks healthy families (Shadmani, 2017).

In general, instances of domestic violence vary from one society to another and from one cultural context to another. If we categorize domestic violence broadly, it can be classified into physical violence against an individual and violence against the spiritual integrity of an individual. Therefore, if we categorize violence based on its negative consequences and effects, we can classify it into four categories: economic (financial) violence, psychological (emotional) violence, physical violence, and sexual violence (Nik Sokhan Shirazi, 2009). Financial or economic violence is a type of violent behavior perpetrated by a man against a woman (Sohrabzadeh & Mansourian Ravandi, 2017) and can manifest in various forms, such as strict control over household expenses, preventing work or occupation, seizing a woman’s bank account or credit card, and opposing and obstructing a woman’s employment, especially if it goes against family norms (Roshanfar, 2003). Examples of economic violence include forcing a spouse, selling her belongings and assets, not providing financial support for the cost of living, and more (Sohrabzadeh & Mansourian Ravandi, 2018).

One of the most common forms of violence against individuals within the family and even outside the family framework is physical violence (Nik Sokhan Shirazi, 2009), which can take various forms such as beating, torture, and murder or even begin with touching a woman’s body and escalate to sexual and physical harassment. In general, physical violence is a physical act intended to harm the body or frighten and control a spouse.

Violence of this kind is not only about physical harm but can also cause spiritual and emotional damage. It may have profound psychological and emotional effects, such as fear, depression, feelings of emptiness and humiliation, low self-esteem, and more (Najafi Abrandabadi, 2003). Physical violence, in general, has a wide range and starts with blows and injuries and extends to severe cases of imprisonment, burning, torture, and murder (Nik Sokhan Shirazi, 2009). Psychological violence is a type of misconduct that is not necessarily physical, manifesting more in repeated criticisms, insults, humiliation, threatening to remarry or divorce, and is often committed by men against women. Sexual abuse (sexual violence) is usually committed by men against women and sometimes, by women against men, in the form of neglect, sexual indifference, and even sexual harassment (Zandi, 2005).

2.2. Social Activism

The roots of global activism can be traced back to traditional forms of protest and social movements (Diaz Romero, 2015). The concept of activism, from Castells’ perspective, encompasses a wide range of issues related to actions taken by individuals, group activists, organizations, institutions, and networks. Activism refers to various activities in political, economic, social, environmental, and other domains aimed at bringing about change in these systems (Khianiki & Basirian Jahromi, 2013).

One of the most prominent forms of activism in society is participation. Participation, a widely recognized phenomenon today, is considered a new phenomenon in the life of human societies. In this context, participation involves voluntary, conscious, and comprehensive involvement in all social, cultural, political, and economic dimensions, each somehow influencing their lives in relation to decision-making processes in these matters (Ranjbarian, 2011). Therefore, in developing societies, the necessary infrastructure and conditions for women’s participation must be provided, and at the same time, beliefs and values that facilitate or hinder the serious presence and interaction of women in economic, social, and political arenas in society must be identified. The promotion of women’s education enhances their sense of effectiveness and efficiency. Women with a sense of empowerment gain more self-confidence. They also participate more in social activities. This participation includes dimensions such as voluntary collaboration in local projects, participation in local or city council elections, willingness to run for city council elections, and membership in groups and associations. One of the most important dimensions of social activism is the social capital existing in society. Various definitions of social capital have been presented based on recognizing common goals, consolidating them, and fostering trust and readiness to move towards those goals (Raisdana, 2013).
2.3. Responsibility

Responsibility refers to the extent of women’s sense of responsibility in their lives, especially in caring for individuals under their supervision. In other words, responsibility involves matters such as attention to upbringing, the destiny and future of their children, ensuring the financial needs of their children, filling the leisure time of their children, and paying attention to the mental and ethical health of their children. The more the woman feels responsible in these areas, undoubtedly, she is responsible (Babaee-Fard, 2013). Responsibility means being responsive to one’s own and others’ needs and performing individual and social tasks to the best of one’s ability (Timouri & Mirzavandi, 2020).

According to the interactionist theory, if individuals engage in social interactions, they will be able to distance themselves from situations of anxiety and stress. They play a significant role in organizing life, leading to an increase in individuals’ self-confidence. Through these interactions, women can engage in cultural activities in addition to economic activities, enriching themselves mentally and avoiding feelings of exclusion (Giddens, 2008).

3. Literature Review

Numerous studies have been conducted on the subject of domestic violence in various countries, and the most important ones will be summarized as follows.

In a study conducted by Abbaszadeh et al. (2010) in the field of domestic violence, specifically the threat to the psychological health of married women in Tabriz, the results indicate that factors such as paternal dominance, the presence of violence in the husband's family, and interference by the husband’s relatives have a statistically significant linear relationship with domestic violence and the psychological health of women at a meaningful level of 0.01.

Pourafkari et al. (2013) focused on examining the influential factors on psychological violence against men. Their research revealed that education and social support have a negative relationship with the level of domestic violence. Additionally, the exercise of power in the family, male authoritarian attitudes, and gender beliefs have a positive relationship with the impact of domestic violence against women.

Saifzadeh and Ghanbari Barzian (2013) conducted research on the role of violence in the divorce rate among women. They claim that physical, psychological, sexual, and economic violence significantly affects the increased demand for divorce by women.

Results from the research conducted in the United States and focusing on newlywed couples reported an 8% prevalence of physical domestic violence against women. Factors such as the young age of women, a history of violence, and non-formal marriages were identified as risk factors for violence (O'Leary et al., 2014).

The findings of the study by Sen and Bolsoy (2017) in Turkey indicated a 30% prevalence of domestic violence. This study also showed that variables such as age, education, employment, social support, migration status, living environment, duration of marriage, age of women at marriage, employment status, education of men, and polygamy have a significant relationship with violence against women (Sen & Bolsoy, 2017).

So far, no independent work has been done on this topic. Despite the valuable content related to this issue, there has been no specific research on the examination of women’s responsiveness and responsibility in preventing violence against women. Most studies have focused on the impact of paternal interference on women, the effect of violence on divorce rates, and various types of violence, as well as an investigation of social factors influencing violence against women. However, this research is distinct from the aforementioned studies in three respects. Firstly, it is conducted in a different geographical area, specifically examining the fifth district of Mashhad. This region is considered almost on the outskirts of the city, providing a better opportunity to investigate various forms of violence (both hidden and overt). Secondly, this research aims to explore the social responsiveness and responsibility of women to examine their impact on preventing violence. Thirdly, the research conducted so far has not focused on the topic of social responsiveness and responsibility, which will be the central focus of this study. This suggests that the article addresses the following research questions:

1) Does women’s accountability contribute to the prevention of domestic violence?
2) Does women’s social activism contribute to the prevention of domestic violence?
4. Research Methodology

This research is of a quantitative nature, with an applied objective and a descriptive-correlational design in terms of data collection. The data collection technique used is a researcher-constructed questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of several sections, totaling 64 items with a Likert scale of five levels.

The population of this study includes married women in the Panj Tan region of Mashhad city. According to the Iran Statistical Center, the population of the Panj Tan region was 279,000 in the year 1399, comprising 76,600 households. The sample size of this research is approximately 384 households, calculated using Cochran's formula. The sample was randomly selected in January 2023 using a random sampling method. The research tool is a researcher-constructed questionnaire with confirmed validity and reliability. After collecting data in the standardized questionnaire format, the data were analyzed using SPSS software.

5. Findings

5.1. Distribution of Frequencies for Variables and Research Indices

Table 1 presents the distribution of demographic variables in the population. The results indicate that 58.9% of individuals fall within the age group of 20 to 40. In terms of educational attainment, 54.9% of females and 65.6% of males have primary education. Furthermore, 75.3% of females are homemakers, while 45.3% of males are employed as laborers. Additionally, 57% of the sample population resides in a personal residence.

<p>| Table 1. Distribution of Frequencies of Demographic Variables |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Frequency       | percent         |
| Age group       |                 |
| Less than 20 years | 17  | 4.4 |
| 20-40           | 226  | 58.9 |
| 41-60           | 132  | 34.4 |
| More than 60 years | 9   | 2.3 |
| The educational level of woman |                 |
| Primary school  | 211  | 54.9 |
| Middle school   | 103  | 26.8 |
| High school diploma | 44  | 11.5 |
| Bachelor        | 18   | 4.7 |
| Master and Ph.D. | 8   | 2.1 |
| The educational level of man |                 |
| Primary school  | 252  | 65.6 |
| Middle school   | 64   | 16.7 |
| High school diploma | 40  | 10.4 |
| Bachelor        | 24   | 6.3 |
| Master and Ph.D. | 4   | 1.0 |
| Woman's occupation |           |
| Housewife       | 289  | 75.3 |
| employed        | 95   | 24.7 |
| Man's occupation |           |
| Daily Worker    | 174  | 45.3 |
| Employee        | 30   | 7.8 |
| Free worker     | 160  | 41.7 |
| Unemployed      | 20   | 5.2 |
| Housing         |       |
| Personal house  | 219  | 57.0 |
| Rental house    | 165  | 43.0 |
| The method of marriage |       |
| Voluntary       | 224  | 58.3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life situation</th>
<th>Involuntary</th>
<th>160</th>
<th>41.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live with husband</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of marriages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The numbers of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No have child</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3,000,000 Tomans (less than 77$)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000,000 to 5,000,000 Tomans (77-129$)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000 to 10,000,000 Tomans (129-257$)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10,000,000 Tomans (more than 257$)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics for the questionnaire items, including the minimum, maximum, mean, standard deviation, and the 25th, 50th (median), and 75th percentiles of the responses.

**Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Questionnaire Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>50th</th>
<th>75th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bank card</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposing financial constraints</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictions on food and clothing</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindrance to work</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced economic activity</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat with a cold weapon</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to suffocate</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punching and kicking</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and abuse</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to view explicit photos and videos</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sexual relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical corruption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to have marital relations during</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menstruation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuses and criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarcastic and biting expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disrespect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprived of seeing my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having children of the same gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing and swearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using vulgar language among people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crying out and yelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing as weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insults and slander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence in the virtual space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's participation in networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in political parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political awareness in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomination in elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's awareness of their rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the right to teach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving the country with knowledge and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright future for our children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With self-confidence in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ideas and initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media’s impact on awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidating women’s position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media's impact on being a homemaker and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housewife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality in the media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal capabilities of women and men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spousal duties 384 3.82 1.00 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Job responsibilities 384 3.47 1.08 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Raising awareness among other women 384 3.33 1.12 1.00 5.00 2.00 3.00 4.00
My responsibilities towards society 384 3.36 1.11 1.00 5.00 3.00 3.00 4.00
Promoting women’s rights 384 3.46 1.06 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Active social activist 384 3.54 1.03 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
University, more successful children 384 3.77 0.91 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Education, a healthy life 384 3.84 0.89 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Effective education in society 384 3.89 0.82 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 4.00
Being a good spouse 384 3.90 0.81 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
Being a good mother 384 3.93 0.80 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 4.00
The duty of activism 384 3.99 0.81 1.00 5.00 3.00 4.00 5.00
Playing a role in society 384 4.00 0.81 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00
Obstacles to women’s employment opportunities 384 4.11 0.77 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00
Raising my children 384 4.20 0.72 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00
Marriage of my children 384 4.23 0.72 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00
Assistance in difficult circumstances 384 4.29 0.65 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00
Love for children and spouse 384 4.30 0.64 1.00 5.00 4.00 4.00 5.00

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for the independent variables extracted from the questionnaire, including minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation. The results indicate that among the independent variables, the responsibility variable has the highest mean (3.86), while domestic violence has the lowest mean (3.03). Considering the standard deviation values, it can be observed that the responsibility variable has the lowest dispersion (0.55), and the domestic violence variable has the highest dispersion (0.87). The median of the coping variable is 3.85 and represents the highest value.

**Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Research Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Percentiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>50th</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.40 3.12 3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.40 3.85 4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.58 3.79 4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation analysis utilized the average scores of the questions to calculate the grades for variables (indicators). According to the Central Limit Theorem, the averages of variables for a large sample size (more than 30) have a normal distribution. Therefore, parametric methods are used for statistical inference. Table 4 reports the Pearson correlation coefficients to examine the relationships between the research variables. Significant correlation coefficients at the 1% level or denoted by ** are indicated. A positive coefficient implies a direct relationship, while a negative coefficient signifies an inverse relationship between two variables. The results of this table indicate that the variable of domestic violence has a significant inverse relationship with the variables of social responsiveness (-0.292) and accountability (-0.263).
Table 4. Pearson Correlation Coefficients between Research Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Domestic violence</th>
<th>Social activism</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>-.292**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-.263**</td>
<td>.624**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Regression Analysis

To investigate the effects of independent variables, responsibility and responsiveness, on the dependent variable, domestic violence, we employ a stepwise multiple linear regression model. Table 5 provides a summary of information related to this regression model.

Table 5. Summary of Regression Model Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
<th>Adjusted R-squared</th>
<th>Standard Error of the Model</th>
<th>Fisher's Statistic</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>35.553</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>20.191</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research follows a step-by-step approach based on variable values, consisting of two stages. In the first stage, the independent variable of social aggressiveness is entered into the model, and in the second stage, the independent variable of responsibility is introduced. The model in the second stage exhibits greater predictive power compared to the first stage, and for result interpretation, attention should be given to the outcomes of the second stage. In each stage, with the entry of a new independent variable, the coefficient of determination increases, such that the model in the second stage has a determination coefficient of 0.096. Given this value, it can be inferred that with the presence of responsibility and social aggression independent variables, 9.6% of the variance in the dependent variable of domestic violence can be effectively predicted. The significance level of the regression model test for the second stage is less than 0.05 (Type I error level), indicating that the multiple linear regression model in the second stage is significant. In other words, using the independent variables in the second stage, the model can predict the dependent variable of domestic violence.

Table 6. Model Coefficient Estimates and Significance Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Non-standardized coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized coefficients (Beta)</th>
<th>T-statistic</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
<th>Variance of Inflation Factor (VIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient Value</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>Coefficient Value</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constant Term</td>
<td>4.651</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>16.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>-0.424</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-5.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Constant Term</td>
<td>5.005</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>15.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>-0.304</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-3.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.132</td>
<td>-2.122</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the second-stage model are as follows: A significant level of meaning (P-Value < 0.05) has been observed for the independent variables of social reactivity and responsibility, indicating that these two variables have a significant impact on the dependent variable of domestic violence. The negative coefficients for social reactivity and domestic violence suggest a negative (inverse) effect of these variables on domestic violence. Considering that the absolute value of the standard coefficient for the social reactivity variable
(0.209) is greater than that of the responsibility variable (0.132), it can be inferred that the social reactivity variable has a greater impact on domestic violence.

If the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value exceeds 10, it indicates multicollinearity or, in other words, a correlation between independent variables in the model, and variables with multicollinearity should be removed. Table 6 results show that there is no multicollinearity among the independent variables in the second-stage model.

To assess the validity of the regression model, three assumptions need to be examined for the residuals:
1. Independence of residuals (autonomous residuals)
2. Homogeneity of residual variances
3. Normality of residuals

To investigate these assumptions, the Durbin-Watson statistic, scatter plots of standardized residuals against standardized predicted values, and Probability-Probability (P-P) plots are used. If the Durbin-Watson statistic falls within the range of 1.5 to 2.5, it indicates no autocorrelation among the residuals. If the scatter plot of residuals against predicted values does not exhibit a specific trend, assumption 2 is confirmed. The normality of residuals is checked using the P-P plot, and if the points on the plot are close to the half-line in the first and third quadrants, assumption 3 is satisfied.

The Durbin-Watson statistic for this research model is 1.521, confirming assumption 1. Considering figures 1 and 2, it can be concluded that assumptions 2 and 3 are also valid. Therefore, the obtained model is deemed sufficiently valid for prediction purposes.

![Figure 1. Standardized Model Predicted Values vs. Standardized Model Residual Values](image1)

![Figure 2. Residual P-P Plot for Assessing Normality of Model Residuals](image2)
In this section, the means of variables are compared across different levels of demographic variables, including age, education of females and males, occupation of females and males, housing status, marital method, living conditions, number of marriages for females and males, number of children, and monthly income. If the sample size at levels of demographic variables is greater than 30, parametric tests will be used for comparison based on the Central Limit Theorem. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test will be employed to assess normality. If the distributions of variables are normal across all levels of demographic variables, independent t-tests (for comparing two groups) and analysis of variance (ANOVA) (for comparing more than two groups) will be used; otherwise, non-parametric tests equivalent to them, namely Mann-Whitney U test (for comparing two groups) and Kruskal-Wallis test (for comparing more than two groups) will be applied. The results of these tests will be reported separately for each demographic variable in the tables below. The assumption of homogeneity of variances will be examined and confirmed using Levene’s test.

Table 7 presents results indicating a significant difference in the mean of the social responsiveness variable at the 5% level of significance across age groups (years) (p-value<0.05). In other words, age groups have a significant impact on the social responsiveness variable. Duncan’s post hoc test results for pairwise comparisons of the means of the social responsiveness variable among different age groups revealed that the mean social responsiveness of individuals under 20 years (4.176) is significantly higher than that of individuals over 60 years (3.183).

Table 7. Examination of the Age Group (Years) Impact on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.034</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.968</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.176</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>7.262</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.872</td>
<td>0.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.734</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.183</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Less than 20 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.124</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>2.556</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.878</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.831</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.544</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that at a 5% error level, there is a significant difference in the mean of three variables: domestic violence, social responsiveness, and responsibility at different educational levels of women (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the educational level of women has a significant impact on all three variables. It can also be observed that with an increase in women’s educational levels, the mean of domestic violence decreases, while social responsiveness and responsibility increase.
Table 8. Examining the Impact of Women's Educational Level on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The educational level of women</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.293</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>Analysis of variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>33.912</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.955</td>
<td>0.748</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.709</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor and higher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.772</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.635</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>Kruskal Wallis analysis</td>
<td>64.182</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.030</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor and higher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>Kruskal Wallis analysis</td>
<td>26.699</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>3.851</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.934</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor and higher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that at a five percent error level, there is a significant difference in the average of all three variables: domestic violence, social responsiveness, and responsibility, across different educational levels of men (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the educational level of men has a significant impact on all three variables. It can also be observed that with an increase in the educational level of men, the average domestic violence decreases, while social responsiveness and responsibility increase.

Table 9. Examination of the Impact of Men's Educational Level on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The educational level of men</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3.269</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>Kruskal Wallis analysis</td>
<td>73.416</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.831</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor and higher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3.684</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>Kruskal Wallis analysis</td>
<td>49.322</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 shows that at a five percent error level, there is a significant difference in the average of all three variables: domestic violence, social reactivity, and responsibility, at different levels of the job variable for women (p-value<0.05). In other words, a woman's occupation has a significant impact on all three variables. It can also be observed that employed women experience lower domestic violence and exhibit higher levels of social reactivity and responsibility.

Table 10. Examining the Impact of Women's Occupation on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Woman's occupation</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3.156</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.656</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3.765</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-3.294</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.995</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3.808</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-3.340</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.037</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that at a five percent level of error, there is a significant difference in the average of all three variables: domestic violence, social responsiveness, and responsibility, at various levels of the job variable for men (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the job of men has a significant impact on all three variables. It can also be observed that male employees experience the least domestic violence and exhibit the highest levels of social responsiveness and responsibility.

Table 11. Examining the Impact of Men's Occupation on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Man's occupation</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Daily Worker</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3.279</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>Kruskal</td>
<td>41.430</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.244</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free worker</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.881</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social activism Daily Worker 174 3.799 0.660 Analysis of 5.385 <0.001 Significant
Table 12 shows that at a 5% error level, there is a significant difference in the average of the domestic violence variable across different levels of housing status (p-value < 0.05). In other words, housing status has a significant impact on the domestic violence variable. It can also be observed that individuals with personal homes experience less domestic violence compared to those with rented homes.

### Table 12. Examining the Effect of Housing Status on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Housing situation</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Personal house</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>2.866</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-4.427</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rental house</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.253</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Personal house</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rental house</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.827</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Personal house</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3.840</td>
<td>0.530</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-1.015</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rental house</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows that at a five percent level of error, there is a significant difference in the mean of all three variables: domestic violence, assertiveness, and responsibility, across different levels of the marriage variable (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the method of marriage has a statistically significant impact on the variables of domestic violence, assertiveness, and responsibility. Additionally, it can be observed that individuals with intentional marriage have lower domestic violence and higher assertiveness and responsibility compared to individuals with non-intentional marriage.

### Table 13. Examination of the Impact of Marriage Method on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Methods of marriage</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.803</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>Independent T-test</td>
<td>-6.460</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.354</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 shows that at a 5% error level, there is a significant difference in the average of the responsibility variable at different levels of the lifestyle variable (p-value < 0.05). In other words, lifestyle has a significant impact on the responsibility variable. It can also be observed that divorced individuals have less responsibility compared to those who are currently living together.

### Table 14. Investigating the Impact of Lifestyle on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Life situation</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with husband</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.013</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>-1.411</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>-1.411</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with husband</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.835</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.740</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with husband</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>3.876</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>-2.249</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that at a five percent level of significance, there is a significant difference in the means of variables related to assertiveness and responsibility at various levels of the variable “number of marriages” (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the number of marriages has a significant impact on assertiveness and responsibility variables. It can also be observed that individuals who have been married twice exhibit lower levels of assertiveness and responsibility compared to other individuals.

### Table 15. Examining the impact of the number of marriages on research variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The number of marriages for women</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>Kruskal</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>Wallis analysis</td>
<td>4.487</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.880</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>3.837</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>4.487</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.071</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>Analysis of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.537</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>(ANOVA) 3.652</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that at a five percent error level, there is a significant difference in the average of the three variables of domestic violence, aggression, and responsibility at different levels of the variable “number of marriages” (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the number of marriages has a statistically significant impact on the variables of domestic violence, aggression, and responsibility. Additionally, it can be observed that men who have been married once exhibit lower levels of domestic violence and higher levels of aggression and responsibility compared to other individuals.

Table 16. Examining the Impact of the Number of Marriages on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>The number of marriages for men</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>Analysis of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.368</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>9.135</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>(ANOVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.865</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>Kruskal analysis</td>
<td>9.485</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.737</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>Wallis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.394</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.897</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>Analysis of</td>
<td>3.103</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.787</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three times and more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.605</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>(ANOVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows that at a five percent error level, there is a significant difference in the means of the three variables of domestic violence, assertiveness, and responsibility at various levels of the variable “number of children” (p-value < 0.05). In other words, the number of children has a significant impact on the variables of domestic violence, assertiveness, and responsibility. It can also be observed that individuals without children exhibit lower levels of domestic violence and higher levels of assertiveness and responsibility compared to other individuals.

Table 17. Examining the Impact of the Number of Children on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Numbers of children</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>No have child</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.402</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>Analysis of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violence</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>9.671</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.061</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>(ANOVA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 shows that at a five percent level of significance, there is a significant difference in the average of the domestic violence variable across different levels of the income variable (p-value < 0.05). In other words, monthly income has a statistically significant effect on the domestic violence variable. Additionally, it can be observed that individuals with higher monthly incomes experience less domestic violence compared to others.

Table 18. Examining the Impact of Monthly Income on Research Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Monthly income</th>
<th>Numbers of participant</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. division</th>
<th>Statistical Test</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Less than 3,000,000 Tomans (less than 77$)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.413</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>21.637</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000 to 5,000,000 Tomans (77-129$)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.023</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000 to 10,000,000 Tomans (129-257$)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2.690</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.999</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10,000,000 Tomans (more than 257%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social activism</td>
<td>Less than 3,000,000 Tomans (less than 77$)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.792</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>Kruskal Wallis analysis Non-Significant</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000 to 5,000,000 Tomans (77-129$)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.797</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000,000 to 10,000,000 Tomans (129-257$)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>3.880</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 10,000,000 Tomans (more than 257%)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.950</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Less than 3,000,000 Tomans (less than 77$)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.898</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>Non-Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Discussion

This research examines domestic violence against married women in five districts of Mashhad, exploring the correlation between social activism and responsibility in preventing domestic violence from a sociological and criminological perspective. Violence against women, both within the familial (domestic) and societal (public) dimensions, poses a serious concern and harm in both developed and developing societies, with variations influenced by cultural and indigenous factors. Throughout history, women worldwide have endured oppression and injustice due to a lack of proper recognition of their rights, often experiencing violence and suppression. Despite advancements in industrial societies and cultural growth influenced by the development of science and technology, domestic violence remains a persistent issue.

Domestic violence, a subset of violence against women, is characterized by higher recurrence rates and underreporting to the police, resulting in more severe social, psychological, and economic consequences. In most cases, it occurs at the hands of the closest family member, typically the spouse. The research results indicate that there is a relationship between domestic violence and social activism and accountability.

Based on standardized coefficients, the impact of social activism on domestic violence is greater than that of responsibility. Additionally, age group analysis reveals a meaningful influence on social activism, with individuals under 20 generally exhibiting higher levels of social activism. Detailed educational level analysis demonstrates that an increase in educational attainment corresponds to a decrease in domestic violence, coupled with an increase in social activism and responsibility. Moreover, occupational analysis suggests that employed women may experience lower levels of domestic violence while demonstrating higher levels of social activism and responsibility.

7. Conclusions

In conclusion, this research demonstrates that factors such as social activism, responsibility, age, education, occupation, and living conditions play crucial roles in preventing domestic violence. Increasing awareness within society regarding these relationships and promoting social actions and responsibility can contribute to reducing domestic violence and enhancing positive family relationships.

This research presents significant findings from statistical analyses on domestic violence, social activism, and responsibility. The results indicate an inverse and meaningful relationship between domestic violence and social activism and accountability.
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