

HUMAN SECURITY AND PATRIARCHAL VIOLENCE: A SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF LUCKNOW DISTRICT

SUMMARY OF Thesis

SUBMITTED TO THE
BABASAHEB BHIMRAO AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY
LUCKNOW

BABASAHEB
BHIMRAO
AMBEDKAR
UNIVERSITY



•LUCKNOW•
प्रज्ञा शील करुणा
ESTABLISHED 1996

FOR AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF
Doctor of Philosophy
IN
SOCIOLOGY

SUBMITTED BY
Prashant Chaudhary
ENROLLMENT NO. 323/10

UNDER SUPERVISION OF
Dr. Jaya Shrivastava
Associate Professor

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
SCHOOL FOR AMBEDKAR STUDIES
BABASAHEB BHIMRAO AMBEDKAR UNIVERSITY

(A CENTRAL UNIVERSITY)
VIDYA VIHAR, RAEBARELI ROAD, LUCKNOW-226 025
UTTAR PRADESH, INDIA

2016

SUMMARY

Human security describes a condition of existence in which basic material needs are met, and in which human dignity, including meaningful participation in the life of the community, can be realized. Such human security is indivisible; it cannot be pursued by or for one group at the expense of another. It directs attention to basic priorities such as life, health, and dignity and it considers degree to which ordinary people are able to fulfil these basic priorities. Human security means protecting people from critical and pervasive threats and situations, building on their strengths and aspirations. It also means creating systems that give people the building blocks of survival, dignity, and livelihood. Human security connects different types of freedoms- freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom to take action on one's own behalf. Human security is therefore: people-centred, multidimensional and interconnected which can be considered under several main categories, i.e. Economic security; Food security; Health security; Environmental security; Political security; Community security; and Personal security.

As we know, since ages women have been victim of patriarchal violence. Patriarchal violence against women built on hegemonic masculinity and the subordination of women is a widespread universal phenomenon. It is supported and reinforced by socially constructed stereotypical gender norms and values that put women in subordinate position, cuts across all caste, religion and education levels. In many societies violence is considered 'normal' and a prerogative of men. Similarly, in India the roots of patriarchal violence are deeply embedded in its socio-cultural structure. Patriarchal violence exists within a socio-cultural environment, which legitimizes the use of power and control against women. It has many harmful consequences for women and it lowers their performance levels due to increased subordination and subjugation to the established patriarchal order. Over the past few decades, the issue of patriarchal violence in its myriad of forms has attained/gained increasing recognition both at national and global level. Despite significant changes in private and public spheres, patriarchal violence affect women from a range of cultural and geographical backgrounds, and it remained low on international human security agendas until recently. It is true that conceptualizing patriarchal violence as a human security issue is an uphill task.

In many societies violence is considered 'normal' and a prerogative of men. The socialization of boys and girls often reflects related cultural norms and values. Cultural violence embedded in the patriarchal structures of Indian society has many harmful consequences for women and it lowers their performance levels due to increased subordination and subjugation to the established patriarchal order. In spite of constitutional and legal safeguards, the women in India continue to suffer, due to lack of awareness of their rights, illiteracy and oppressive practices and customs. It is realized that the long run supremacy of male over female in all respect in the patriarchal society in India is highly responsible for arresting the empowerment of women.

While feminism argues that it is patriarchy and male dominance which is mainly responsible for the subordinate position of women in society, sociological perspective explains the powerlessness of women through process of socialization, which ultimately leads to patriarchal violence and the inability of women to defend them. Patriarchal violence exists within a social environment, which legitimates the use of power and control against women. However, both these perspectives look at the women as an object which is always influenced by external circumstances and react to them in a described manner but these perspectives neglect her ability to analyse her situations and her perception of self-dealing with abusive circumstances. Thus, the present study analysed how gender power structure affects patriarchal violence and human security. It also tried to examine the interlinkages between different components of human security and patriarchal violence.

The study is organised in seven chapters. List of referred books, reports, journals and magazines is given at the end as per alphabetical order. The first chapter deals with Introduction which comprises background to the study including the concepts of human security, patriarchal violence as well as their linkages. Need of Study, its objectives, hypotheses, selection of variables, significance and limitations are also described in this chapter. This chapter also provides details about research methodology, including nature and research Design, area of study, sample Plan, tools and methods of data collection and statistical tools which were used to analyse the data. The second chapter entitled Review of Literature and Conceptual Framework provides a review of theories and existing literature about the subject matter, research gap and Conceptual Framework. The third chapter entitled Human Security and Patriarchal Violence: A Conceptual Analysis deals with prevalence of patriarchal

violence in India, its linkages with prevailing socio-cultural structure of society, essential elements of human security, government policies and measure taken to ensure human security and prevent patriarchal violence. It also discusses linkages between various elements/indicators of human security and patriarchal violence and priorities in terms of preventing violence against women and to ensure their well being. In fourth chapter entitled Profile of Respondents, analysis of data related to various demographic indicators of respondents e.g. age, religion, caste, education, nature of family, number of members in family, main occupation and income of the family and facilities available in their house, has been presented. The fifth chapter of the thesis provides details about Prevalence of Patriarchal Violence and Status of Human Security in Indian Society: An Empirical Analysis, which include analysis of information related to status of various elements of human security and patriarchal violence and relation between socio-economic dimensions and various dimensions of human security and Patriarchal Violence. Chapter Six entitled Establishing Interlinkages between Human Security and Patriarchal Violence on the Basis of Empirico-Statistical Analysis provides details about analysis of data to examine correlation and association between various elements of human security and patriarchal violence and to prioritise the relevance of the different dimensions of human security with patriarchal violence. Finally, chapter seven entitled Summary and Conclusion provides summary of study, result, comparison of the findings of present and previous studies.

The main objective of the present study was to study the interlikage between Human Security and Patriarchal Violence. The following were the specific objectives of this study:

1. To analyse the concepts of human security and patriarchal violence.
2. To examine the interlinkages between various dimensions of human security and patriarchal violence from sociological perspective.
3. To prioritise the relevance of the different dimensions of human security with patriarchal violence.
4. To explore the nature of relationship between different aspects of human security and patriarchal violence.
5. To find out the policy implications of human security for removal of patriarchal violence.

The hypotheses of the present study were:

1. There is close interlinkages between human security and patriarchal violence.

2. Personal and economic securities have strong negative association with patriarchal violence.
3. Political security and food securities have medium association with patriarchal violence.
4. Environment and health security have weak negative association with patriarchal violence.
5. There is relationship between human security and severity of patriarchal violence.
6. Strengthening of human security for women leads to eradication of violence against them.

It was conceptualized in present study that patriarchal violence exist in study area, but it differs in nature and intensity with variance in geographical area (Urban and Rural), existing social structure of social group, family as well as socio-economic profile of individuals and reach of human security measures. The nature and intensity of patriarchal violence is the sum of function of various socio-economic factors/parameters (age, region and caste, educational status, occupation & economic status of self and family, status of rituals and norms, geographical area) and sum of function of reach to human security measures (07 selected areas: Economic security, Food Security, Environmental security, Health Security, Personal security, Community security, & Political security).

To analyse the prevalence of patriarchal violence, status of human security measures and correlation between prevalence of patriarchal violence and selected areas of human security, and difference with various socio-cultural categories of individuals, measurement of selected variables of human security and severity/nature of patriarchal violence has been planned by collecting data from selected respondents through semi-structured interview schedule constructed with the help of various scales, questionnaire and inventories made by scholars.

Cross-sectional descriptive research design is adopted in present study, in which 424 adult women (212 each from rural & urban areas) are selected as respondents, 01 each from randomly selected families from purposively selected rural and urban areas of Lucknow district. On completion of survey, 389 respondents could only be interviewed and rest others were excluded as per inclusion/exclusion criteria.

To investigate the nature and intensity of linkages, if any, between patriarchal violence and status of existing human security measures, data collected from 389

respondents were analysis with the help of various statistical tools e.g. percent, average, t-test, Chi-square test, Karl Pearson correlation coefficient, correlation matrix and multiple regression.

The results obtained from the analysis are as follows:

- More than half (58.86%) of respondents belong to age group of 26-33 yrs. (23.39%), 34-41 yrs. (19.02%), or age group of 42-49 yrs. (16.45%).
- Most (95.89%) of respondents belong to Hindu (68.12%) or Muslim (27.76%) religion, but percentage of Hindu respondents in rural area (72.59%) is more than urban area (63.54%). Most (80.21%) of respondents belong to general (46.79%) or OBC (33.42%) caste, but percentage of respondents belong to general caste in urban area (50.52%) is more than rural area (43.15%).
- More than one-third (42.16%) of respondents are educated up to high school (21.34) or intermediate (20.82), and a significant portion (13.88%) of respondents are not having any basic education. Percentage of respondents not having any basic education is much more in rural area (21.83%) than urban area (5.73%).
- Most (85.60%) of respondents are married, whereas rest others are unmarried (8.74%), widow (2.31%), divorcee (1.80%) and living in separation (1.54%). More than two-third (66.84%) of respondents are housewife, whereas rest others are labourer (12.08%), working in private (8.48%) or government (4.37%) sector or home based business women (8.23%). Only few (2.83%) respondents are having monthly income more than Rs. 25,000.
- More than half (57.84%) of respondents belong to nuclear family. Percentage of respondents belong to nuclear family is more in urban area (64.58%) than rural area (51.27%).
- Number of female members with comparison to male is more in rural area, as sex ratio at rural area (944) is more than the urban area (927) [Table 4.9].
- More than two-third (68.13%) of respondents belong to families having 4-5 (32.65%) or 6-7 (35.48%) members. Approximately three-fourth (72.49%) of respondents belong to families having 3 to 4 dependent members (47.30%) or

5-6 dependent members (25.19%). More than three-fourth (77.12%) of respondents belong to families having 01 independent member (32.13%) or 2 dependent members (44.99%).

- More than one-third (42.93%) of respondents belong to families having agriculture (26.48%) or daily wage labour as main occupation (16.45%), but the percentage of respondents belong to families having agriculture or daily wage labour as main occupation is much more in rural area (73.10%) than urban area. More than half (58.61%) of respondents belong to families having monthly income between Rs. 6000 to 10000 (27.76%) or Rs. 10001 to 20000 (30.85%), but the percentage of respondents belong to families having monthly income upto Rs. 10,000 is much more in rural area (67.52%) than urban area (17.70%).
- More than two-third (68.38%) of respondents is staying in pucca house, but the percentage of respondents staying in pucca house is much more in urban area (92.19%) than rural area (45.18%). Approximately three-fourth (71.27%) of respondents are staying in satisfactory (37.93%) or good (33.93%) living condition, but the percentage of respondents staying in unsatisfactory living condition is much more in rural area (39.59%) than urban area (17.71%).
- Approximately two-third (64.78%) of respondents opined that level of gender equality in their family/society is satisfactory (38.30%) or highly satisfactory (26.48%). Status of women in urban families/society is higher than rural area as average marks of urban respondents (38.91) is more (3.13) than rural respondents (35.78) [Table 4.18]. There is highly significant difference in mean score of status of women in family/society as viewed by rural and urban respondents (t -value = 3.385).
- Approximately three-fourth (74.81%) of respondents feels high (39.33%) or medium (35.48%) level of patriarchal violence in their family/society.
- Approximately three-fourth (74.55%) of respondents viewed the status of existing status of human security as poor (40.62%) or average (33.93%).

More than three-fourth (75.83%) of respondents viewed the status of existing personal security as poor (40.87%) or average (34.96%). More than two-third (70.18%) of respondents viewed the status of existing food security as poor (31.88%) or average (38.30%). Approximately three-fourth (74.03%) of respondents viewed the status of existing community security as poor (36.50%) or average (37.53%) . More than two-third (69.41%) of respondents viewed the status of existing health security as poor (28.79%) or average (40.62%). More than three-fourth (76.09%) of respondents viewed the status of existing economic security as poor (40.87%) or average (35.22%). More than three-fourth (75.32%) of respondents viewed the status of existing political security as poor (38.30%) or average (37.02%). Approximately three-fourth (74.55%) of respondents viewed the status of existing environmental security as poor (38.82%) or average (35.73%).

- 45.69% of rural and 32.81% of urban respondents feel high level of patriarchal violence in their family/society, whereas 21.32% of rural respondents and 29.17% of urban respondents have viewed the prevalence of patriarchal violence in their family/society as low .
- Level of patriarchal violence in rural area is more than urban area and difference in mean score of patriarchal violence among rural and urban respondents is highly significant (t-value = 2.611).
- 45.26% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 30.10% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 17.52% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 37.86% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is highly significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society ($\chi^2 = 13.914$) .

- 40.62% of respondents are in middle-aged group, 31.88% are in young age-group and 27.51% of respondents are in elderly-aged group.
- 44.35% of young respondents and 34.58% of elderly respondents have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 22.58% of young respondents and 28.97% of elderly respondents have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is no significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different age group ($\chi^2 = 2.689$).
- 43.96% of general caste respondents and 27.27% of SC respondents have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 21.43% of general caste respondents and 38.96% of SC respondents have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different caste ($\chi^2 = 11.380$).
- 42.16% of respondents are having education up to medium level, whereas 39.07% of respondents are having education up to lower level and 18.77% of respondents are educated up to higher level. 45.39% of low educated respondents and 27.40% of highly educated respondents have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 20.39% of low educated respondents and 39.73% of highly educated respondents have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is no significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different educational status ($\chi^2 = 12.302$).
- 66.84% of respondents are in dependent economic category and 33.16% of respondents are in independent economic category. 43.46% of economically dependent respondents and 31.01% of independent respondents feel high level prevalence of patriarchal violence in their family/society, whereas 20.00% of economically dependent respondents and 35.66% of economically independent respondents have viewed the prevalence of patriarchal violence in their family/society as low. There is highly significant difference in mean score of patriarchal violence among economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 3.183).

- 43.96% of respondents belong to families having traditional household occupation, whereas 31.88% of respondents belong to families adopted moderate occupation and 24.16% of respondents belong to families of modern occupations. 45.03% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 27.66% of respondents of modern household occupation have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 19.30% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 38.30% of respondents of modern household occupation have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is highly significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 13.705$).
- 38.56% of respondents belong to the families of low income group; whereas 33.93% of respondents belong to the families of middle income group and 27.51% of respondents belong to the families of high income group. 45.33% of respondents of LIG families and 29.91% of respondents of HIG families have expressed high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 21.67% of respondents LIG families and 36.45% of respondents of HIG families have expressed low level of patriarchal violence. There is significant difference in level of patriarchal violence viewed by respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 11.809$).
- 43.15% of rural and 38.02% of urban respondents feel that status of human security available to them is poor, whereas 20.81% of rural respondents and 30.21% of urban respondents have viewed the status of human security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score of status of human security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 3.023).
- 46.72% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 28.16% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of human security available to them is poor, whereas 20.44% of respondents belong to opinion

of below satisfaction level of women's position and 38.83% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of human security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of human security ($\chi^2 = 15.581$).

- 42.74% of young respondents and 36.45% of elderly respondents felt that status of human security available to them is poor, whereas 24.19% of young respondents and 30.84% of elderly respondents have assessed it as good. There is no significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of human security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 2.568$).
- 44.51% of general caste respondents and 29.87% of SC respondents assessed status of human security available to them as poor, whereas 20.33% of general caste respondents and 38.96% of SC respondents assessed status of human security as good. There is a significant difference in status of human security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 10.583$).
- 46.71% of low educated respondents and 28.77% of highly educated respondents assessed status of human security available to them as poor, whereas 21.05% of low educated respondents and 39.73% of highly educated respondents assessed status of human security available to them as good. There is a significant difference in status of human security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 11.850$).
- 41.92% of economically dependent respondents and 37.98% of independent respondents assessed status of human security available to them as poor, whereas 23.46% of economically dependent respondents and 29.46% of economically independent respondents assessed status of human security as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score for status of human security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 3.070).

- 45.03% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 29.79% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of human security available to them as poor, whereas 19.88% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 38.30% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of human security as good. There is significant difference in status of human security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 12.238$).
- 46.67% of respondents of LIG families and 27.10% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of human security available to them as poor, whereas 19.33% of respondents LIG families and 38.32% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of human security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of human security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 16.526$).
- 44.16% of rural and 37.50% of urban respondents feel that status of personal security available to them is poor, whereas 18.78% of rural respondents and 29.69% of urban respondents have viewed the status of personal security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score of status of personal security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 2.888).
- 46.72% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 28.16% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of personal security available to them is poor, whereas 18.98% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 36.89% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of personal security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of personal security ($\chi^2 = 15.112$).

- 43.55% of young respondents and 36.45% of elderly respondents felt that status of personal security available to them is poor, whereas 20.16% of young respondents and 30.84% of elderly respondents have assessed it as good. There is no significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of personal security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 3.910$).
- 44.51% of general caste respondents and 31.17% of SC respondents assessed status of personal security available to them as poor, whereas 20.33% of general caste respondents and 36.36% of SC respondents assessed status of personal security as good. There is no significant difference in status of personal security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 8.603$).
- 46.71% of low educated respondents and 28.77% of highly educated respondents assessed status of personal security available to them as poor, whereas 19.74% of low educated respondents and 39.73% of highly educated respondents assessed status of personal security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in status of personal security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 13.689$).
- 43.85% of economically dependent respondents and 31.78% of independent respondents assessed status of personal security available to them as poor, whereas 20.38% of economically dependent respondents and 31.78% of economically independent respondents assessed status of personal security as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score for status of personal security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 3.132).
- 45.03% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 30.85% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of personal security available to them as poor, whereas 19.30% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 36.17% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of personal security as good. There is

significant difference in status of personal security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 10.854$).

- 46.67% of respondents of LIG families and 28.04% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of personal security available to them as poor, whereas 18.00% of respondents LIG families and 37.38% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of personal security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of personal security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 16.876$).
- 34.52% of rural and 29.17% of urban respondents feel that status of food security available to them is poor, whereas 26.40% of rural respondents and 33.33% of urban respondents have viewed the status of food security available to them as good. There is no significant difference in mean score of status of food security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 1.598).
- 40.88% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 26.21% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of food security available to them is poor, whereas 19.71% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 38.83% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of food security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of food security ($\chi^2 = 13.791$).
- 38.71% of young respondents and 24.30% of elderly respondents felt that status of food security available to them is good, whereas 25.00% of young respondents and 41.12% of elderly respondents have assessed it as poor. There is significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of food security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 10.893$).
- 25.27% of general caste respondents and 44.16% of SC respondents assessed status of food security available to them as poor, whereas 35.71% of general

caste respondents and 24.68% of SC respondents assessed status of food security as good. There is significant difference in status of food security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 11.676$).

- 33.85% of economically dependent respondents and 27.91% of independent respondents assessed status of food security available to them as poor, whereas 28.08% of economically dependent respondents and 33.33% of economically independent respondents assessed status of food security as good. There is no significant difference in mean score for status of food security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 1.403).
- 39.59% of rural and 33.33% of urban respondents feel that status of community security available to them is poor, whereas 22.84% of rural respondents and 29.17% of urban respondents have viewed the status of community security available to them as good. There is no significant difference in mean score of status of community security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 1.635).
- 46.72% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 25.24% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of community security available to them is poor, whereas 18.25% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 29.13% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of community security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of community security ($\chi^2 = 14.978$).
- 30.77% of general caste respondents and 48.05% of SC respondents assessed status of community security available to them as poor, whereas 32.97% of general caste respondents and 16.88% of SC respondents assessed status of community security as good. There is significant difference in status of community security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 11.933$).

- 43.42% of low educated respondents and 21.92% of highly educated respondents assessed status of community security available to them as poor, whereas 19.74% of low educated respondents and 41.10% of highly educated respondents assessed status of community security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in status of community security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 15.073$).
- 42.00% of respondents of LIG families and 24.30% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of community security available to them as poor, whereas 19.33% of respondents LIG families and 39.25% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of community security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of community security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 16.529$).
- 33.50% of rural and 23.96% of urban respondents feel that status of health security available to them is poor, whereas 24.37% of rural respondents and 36.98% of urban respondents have viewed the status of health security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score of status of health security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 2.892).
- 37.23% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 22.33% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of health security available to them is poor, whereas 20.44% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 39.81% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of health security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of health security ($\chi^2 = 13.638$).
- 20.16% of young respondents and 39.25% of elderly respondents felt that status of health security available to them is poor, whereas 41.13% of young

respondents and 22.43% of elderly respondents have assessed it as good. There is highly significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of health security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 15.112$).

- 21.98% of general caste respondents and 42.86% of SC respondents assessed status of health security available to them as poor, whereas 36.81% of general caste respondents and 22.08% of SC respondents assessed status of health security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of health security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 13.785$).
- 35.53% of low educated respondents and 20.55% of highly educated respondents assessed status of health security available to them as poor, whereas 25.00% of low educated respondents and 43.84% of highly educated respondents assessed status of health security available to them as good. There is a significant difference in status of health security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 11.195$).
- 32.31% of economically dependent respondents and 21.71% of independent respondents assessed status of health security available to them as poor, whereas 26.54% of economically dependent respondents and 38.76% of economically independent respondents assessed status of health security as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score for status of health security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 2.845).
- 32.16% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 23.40% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of health security available to them as poor, whereas 22.22% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 44.68% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of health security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of health security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 14.488$).

- 34.67% of respondents of LIG families and 17.76% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of health security available to them as poor, whereas 24.00% of respondents LIG families and 42.99% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of health security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of health security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 14.421$).
- 46.19% of rural and 35.42% of urban respondents feel that status of economic security available to them is poor, whereas 18.27% of rural respondents and 29.69% of urban respondents have viewed the status of economic security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score of status of economic security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 2.806).
- 48.91% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 32.04% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of economic security available to them is poor, whereas 14.60% of respondents belong to opinion of below satisfaction level of women's position and 34.95% of respondents belong to opinion of highly satisfactory level of women's position felt that status of economic security available to them is good. There is highly significant difference between different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society w.r.t. status of economic security ($\chi^2 = 14.674$).
- 47.25% of general caste respondents and 28.57% of SC respondents assessed status of economic security available to them as poor, whereas 18.68% of general caste respondents and 28.57% of SC respondents assessed status of economic security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of economic security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 13.342$).
- 46.71% of low educated respondents and 28.77% of highly educated respondents assessed status of economic security available to them as poor, whereas 19.08% of low educated respondents and 39.73% of highly educated

respondents assessed status of economic security available to them as good. There is highly significant difference in status of economic security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 14.152$).

- 45.85% of economically dependent respondents and 31.78% of independent respondents assessed status of economic security available to them as poor, whereas 18.46% of economically dependent respondents and 34.88% of economically independent respondents assessed status of economic security as good. There is highly significant difference in mean score for status of economic security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 3.637).
- 45.61% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 28.72% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of economic security available to them as poor, whereas 17.54% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 36.17% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of economic security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of economic security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 13.667$).
- 44.67% of respondents of LIG families and 30.84% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of economic security available to them as poor, whereas 20.00% of respondents LIG families and 33.64% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of economic security as good. There is significant difference in status of economic security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 9.516$).
- 35.53% of rural and 41.15% of urban respondents feel that status of political security available to them is poor, whereas 29.95% of rural respondents and 19.27% of urban respondents have viewed the status of political security available to them as good. There is significant difference in mean score of status of political security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 2.056).

- 35.48% of young respondents and 45.79% of elderly respondents felt that status of political security available to them is poor, whereas 31.45% of young respondents and 19.63% of elderly respondents have assessed it as good. There is no significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of political security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 7.464$).
- 41.21% of general caste respondents and 27.27% of SC respondents assessed status of political security available to them as poor, whereas 19.78% of general caste respondents and 40.26% of SC respondents assessed status of political security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of political security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 13.320$).
- 40.13% of low educated respondents and 31.51% of highly educated respondents assessed status of political security available to them as poor, whereas 21.71% of low educated respondents and 35.62% of highly educated respondents assessed status of political security available to them as good. There is no significant difference in status of political security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 5.887$).
- 40.77% of economically dependent respondents and 33.33% of independent respondents assessed status of political security available to them as poor, whereas 23.85% of economically dependent respondents and 26.36% of economically independent respondents assessed status of political security as good. There is no significant difference in mean score for status of political security between economically dependent and independent respondents (t-value = 1.355).
- 33.92% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 41.49% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of political security available to them as poor, whereas 29.82% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 18.09% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of political security as good. There is no

significant difference in status of political security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 5.647$).

- 36.00% of respondents of LIG families and 43.18% of respondents of MIG families assessed status of political security available to them as poor, whereas 28.67% of respondents LIG families and 19.70% of respondents of MIG families assessed status of political security as good. There is no significant difference in status of political security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 3.812$).
- 36.55% of rural and 41.15% of urban respondents feel that status of environment security available to them is poor, whereas 28.43% of rural respondents and 22.40% of urban respondents have viewed the status of environment security available to them as good. There is no significant difference in mean score of status of environment security among rural and urban respondents (t-value = 1.345).
- 35.48% of young respondents and 42.99% of elderly respondents felt that status of environment security available to them is poor, whereas 31.45% of young respondents and 20.56% of elderly respondents have assessed it as good. There is no significant difference between respondents of different age group w.r.t. status of environment security viewed by them ($\chi^2 = 4.095$).
- 31.87% of general caste respondents and 50.65% of SC respondents assessed status of environment security available to them as poor, whereas 30.77% of general caste respondents and 18.18% of SC respondents assessed status of environment security as good. There is significant difference in status of environment security between different caste ($\chi^2 = 10.006$).
- 45.39% of low educated respondents and 28.77% of highly educated respondents assessed status of environment security available to them as poor, whereas 20.39% of low educated respondents and 38.36% of highly educated respondents assessed status of environment security available to them as good.

- There is significant difference in status of environment security between different educational status of respondents ($\chi^2 = 10.677$).
- 43.27% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 29.79% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of environment security available to them as poor, whereas 19.30% of respondents of traditional household occupation and 37.23% of respondents of modern household occupation assessed status of environment security as good. There is significant difference in status of environment security between different household occupational categories ($\chi^2 = 10.886$).
- 44.00% of respondents of LIG families and 27.10% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of environment security available to them as poor, whereas 18.67% of respondents LIG families and 37.38% of respondents of HIG families assessed status of environment security as good. There is highly significant difference in status of environment security for the respondents of different household income group ($\chi^2 = 14.371$).
- 47.17% of respondents having poor status of personal security and 24.47% of respondents opined good status of personal security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 18.87% of respondents having poor status of personal security and 40.43% of respondents opined good status of personal security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is highly significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of personal security ($\chi^2 = 19.782$). Level of patriarchal violence is highly and negatively correlated to status of personal security ($r = (-) 0.8839$).
- 45.97% of respondents having poor status of food security and 30.17% of respondents opined good status of food security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 19.35% of respondents having poor status of food security and 36.21% of respondents opined good status of food security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is significant association

between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of food security ($\chi^2 = 12.362$). Level of patriarchal violence is highly and negatively correlated to status of food security ($r = (-) 0.7572$).

- 47.18% of respondents having poor status of Community security and 25.74% of respondents opined good status of Community security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 18.31% of respondents having poor status of Community security and 39.60% of respondents opined good status of Community security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is highly significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of Community security ($\chi^2 = 18.852$). Level of patriarchal violence is highly and negatively correlated to status of Community security ($r = (-) 0.8192$).
- 44.74% of respondents having poor status of health security and 30.77% of respondents opined good status of health security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 20.18% of respondents having poor status of health security and 35.90% of respondents opined good status of health security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of health security ($\chi^2 = 11.202$). Level of patriarchal violence is highly and negatively correlated to status of health security ($r = (-) 0.6499$).
- 45.91% of respondents having poor status of economic security and 26.88% of respondents opined good status of economic security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 20.13% of respondents having poor status of economic security and 37.63% of respondents opined good status of economic security have faced low level of patriarchal violence [Table 6.9(i)].
- There is highly significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of economic security ($\chi^2 =$

13.352). Level of patriarchal violence is highly and negatively correlated to status of economic security ($r = (-) 0.7991$).

- 42.95% of respondents having poor status of political security and 29.17% of respondents opined good status of political security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 20.81% of respondents having poor status of political security and 36.46% of respondents opined good status of political security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of political security ($\chi^2 = 9.891$). Level of patriarchal violence is significantly and negatively correlated to status of political security ($r = (-) 0.3439$).
- 42.38% of respondents having poor status of environmental security and 32.32% of respondents opined good status of environmental security have faced high level of patriarchal violence, whereas 21.85% of respondents having poor status of environmental security and 34.34% of respondents opined good status of environmental security have faced low level of patriarchal violence. There is no significant association between distribution of respondents as per level of patriarchal violence w.r.t. status of environmental security ($\chi^2 = 6.302$). Level of patriarchal violence is significantly and negatively correlated to status of environmental security ($r = (-) 0.2952$).
- Personal Security ($r=0.341$), Community Security ($r=0.819$), Economic Security ($r=0.799$) and Food Security ($r=0.757$) are highly and negatively correlated to patriarchal violence, where as Health Security ($r=0.650$) is medium correlated and Political Security ($r=0.344$) is significantly correlated to patriarchal violence. Most of the selected dimensions of Human Security are also significantly inter-correlated to each other. Correlation between patriarchal violence and selected dimensions of human security are highly

confirmative, as values of Multiple R (0.94391), R Square (0.89097) and Adjusted R Square (0.88897) are very close to 01.

- Regression model developed for prediction of positive impact of selected Human Security measures on Patriarchal violence indicates that Personal Security (PS) has highest interlinkage with patriarchal violence, followed by Community Security (CS), Economic Security (ES), Food Security (FS), Health Security (HS) and Political Security (PolS). Environmental Security (EvnS) has very less interlinkages with patriarchal violence.

The conclusion of the study are as follows:

- High prevalence of patriarchal violence is found in respondents' family/society.
- Highly significant difference in level of patriarchal violence was found between rural and urban respondents, respondents of different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, economically dependent and independent respondents, and respondents of different household occupational categories. Significant difference in level of patriarchal violence was found between respondents of different caste and respondents of different household income group.
- Prevailing status of human security measures is poor for of its all selected dimensions, i.e. economic security (76.09%), personal security (75.83%), political security (75.32%), environmental security (74.55%), community security (74.03%), food security (70.18%) and health security (69.41%).
- Highly significant difference in status of personal security was found between rural and urban respondents, different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, respondents of different educational status, economically dependent and independent respondents, and respondents of different household income group, whereas a significant difference in status of personal security was found between different household occupational categories.

- Highly significant difference in status of food security was found between respondents of different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, whereas significant difference in status of food security was found between respondents of different age group, and respondents of different caste.
- Highly significant difference in status of community security was found between respondents of different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, respondents of different educational status, and between respondents of different household income group, whereas a significant difference in status of community security was found between respondents of different caste.
- Highly significant difference in status of health security was found between rural and urban respondents, different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, respondents of different age group, respondents of different caste, economically dependent and independent respondents, respondents of different household occupational categories, and respondents of different household income group, whereas a significant difference in status of health security was found between respondents of different educational status.
- Highly significant difference in status of economic security was found between rural and urban respondents, respondents of different opinion-groups of women's position in family/society, respondents of different caste, respondents of different educational status, economically dependent and independent respondents, and respondents of different household occupational categories, whereas a significant difference in status of economic security was found between respondents of different household income group.
- Highly significant difference in status of political security was found between respondents of different caste, whereas a significant difference in status of political security was found between rural and urban respondents.

- Highly significant difference in status of environment security was found between respondents of different household income group, whereas a significant difference in status of environment security was found between respondents of different caste, respondents of different educational status of respondents, and respondents of different household occupational categories.
- Highly significant association was found between level of patriarchal violence and status of personal security, status of Community security, and status of economic security, whereas a significant association was found between level of patriarchal violence and status of food security, status of health security and status of political security.
- Personal Security, Community Security, Economic Security and Food Security are found highly and negatively correlated to patriarchal violence, where as Health Security is found medium correlated and Political Security is found significantly correlated to patriarchal violence.
- Personal Security has highest interlinkage with patriarchal violence, followed by Community Security, Economic Security, Food Security, Health Security and Political Security. The least interlinkage was found between Environmental Security and patriarchal violence.

Further, these findings also confirm that hypotheses of study are true.

Policy implications of the research findings and some useful suggestion for further research are also given at the end.