

Predictors of attitude toward Wife Battering among Nigerian Men: Evidence from Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2003

Amos O. Oyedokun, Doctoral Candidate, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa and Assistant Lecturer, Obafemi Awolowo University, aooyedokun@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper examines the predictors of attitude toward wife battery among Nigerian men using the most recent Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey. Results show that religious affiliation, number of unions, type of earnings for work ($P < 0.05$); literacy and frequency of watching television ($P < 0.01$) were significant predictors of holding on to mixed views about wife battering, while wealth index, type of earnings for work and portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay significantly predict that Nigerian men will hold on to traditional ideas ($P < 0.01$). The paper concludes that men with low socioeconomic status are more likely to hold on to traditional views about the acceptability of wife battering in Nigeria.

Introduction

Worldwide, one of the most common forms of violence against women (VAW) is abuse by their husbands or other intimate male partners (WHO 2005, 2006; Pallitto and O'Campo 2005; McCloskey et al. 2005; Adames and Campbell 2005; Janet de Merode 1994; WHO 1997; Heise 1999; UNFPA 1999; Fathalla 2005; Morrison et al. 2004). Partner violence occurs in all countries and transcends social, economic, religious, and cultural boundaries (Heise and Garcia-Moreno 2002; Ganju et al. 2004). Although, women can also be violent, and abuse exists in some same-sex relationships, the vast majority of partner abuse is perpetrated by men against their female partners. Feminists define spousal abuse as maltreatment, mistreatment, or ill-treatment of a spouse. They believe that spousal abuse is discernible only through a scrutiny of the social situation (Omonubi-McDonnell 2003). Abuse has been found to be one of the factors limiting women's sexual and reproductive autonomy (Garcia-Moreno et al. 2002; WHO 2005). While research into domestic violence is in its early stages especially in the developing countries (Nigeria inclusive), there is growing agreement about its nature and the various factors causing it. Often referred to as "wife-beating", "battering", or "domestic violence", intimate partner abuse is generally part of a pattern of abusive behaviour and control rather than an isolated act of physical aggression which is mostly against the women.

Partner abuse can take a variety of forms including physical assault such as hits, slaps, kicks, and beatings; psychological abuse, such as constant belittling, intimidation, and humiliation; and coercive sex. Also, it frequently includes controlling behaviours such as isolating a woman from family and friends, monitoring her movements, and restricting her access to resources (Miranda 1994; Population Reports 1999). Studies from around the world show that 10% to over 50% of women reported being hit or otherwise physically harmed by an intimate male partner at some point in their lives (Population Reports 1999, WHO 2006; Xu et al. 2005; Hollander 2005; Parish et al. 2004; Hindin 2003; Coker et al. 2000; Coker and Richter 1998; Tonelli 2004). Worldwide, studies identify a consistent list of events that are said to "trigger" violence and these include not obeying husband, talking back, not having food ready on time, failure to care adequately for the children or home, questioning about money or girlfriends, going somewhere without husband's permission, refusal to have sex when the husband wants, or expressing suspicions of infidelity (Armstrong 1998; Bradley 1985; Gonzalez 1998; Hassan 1995; Jejeebhoy 1998; Michau 1998; Osakue and Hilber 1998; Schuler et al. 1996; Zimmerman 1995; Verma and Collumbien 2003; LLika et al. 2002; Hindin and Adair 2002). All of these constitute transgression of gender norms especially in every patriarchal society where women are expected to be seen and never to be heard. The situation is not so different in today's Nigeria in spite of various programmes by civil society organisations.

In many developing countries, women share the notion that men have the right to discipline their wives by using force. In rural Egypt, for example, at least 80% of women say that beatings are justified under certain circumstances (El-Zanaty et al. 1996) and one of the circumstances that women themselves cite is refusing a man sex (Bawah et al. 1999; David and Chin 1998; El-Zanaty et al. 1996; Rosales et al. 1999). Refusing a man sex is also one of the reasons women cite most often as triggering beatings (Khan et al. 1996; National Sex and Reproduction Research Team and Jenkins 1994; Wood and Jewkes 1997; Zimmerman 1995). Studies from as diverse settings as Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Zambia and Zimbabwe show that wife abuse is perceived as acceptable behaviour and justified as a normal and acceptable part of married life (Schuler et al. 1996; Jejeebhoy 1998; Abdullah et al. 1995; Glantz and Halperin 1996; Bradley 1988; U.N. 1993; Njovana and Watts 1996). In contrast, studies pointing to the perceived unacceptability of such behaviour are rare (Choi and Edleson 1996).

Pallitto and O'Campo (2005) found using a multi-level data in Colombia that living in a municipality with high rates of male patriarchal control significantly increased women's odds of having an unintended pregnancy by almost four times. Dunkle and colleagues (2004) found in a study in South Africa that women with violent or controlling male partners are at increased risk of HIV infection and that abusive men are more likely to have HIV and impose risky sexual practices on partners. Hollander (2005) found that Chinese women whose beliefs and experiences reflect traditional norms that limit gender inequality may be at increased risk of being subjected to intimate partner violence, and that several factors that suggest adherence to traditional gender roles were associated with a woman's likelihood of reporting intimate partner violence. For example, according to Hollander (2005), women who had ever turned down a job because of their partner had elevated odds of reporting abuse ever or in the past year, as did women who thought that wife-beating is sometime justified. Ahmed (2005) found in a study in Matlab, Bangladesh, that age, schooling, age of household head, and self-rated poverty status of household were important predictors of violence. Significant positive associations with all forms of violence exist for lack of completion of primary school, history of violence exposure in women's families of orientation either through witnessing violence between parents while growing up or direct experience of physical violence perpetrated by family members, partner's jealousy, partner's need for control, partner's history of drunkenness, and female-dominated financial decision-making according to Gage (2005). Also, neighbourhood poverty and male unemployment, number of living children at home, women's attitudinal acceptance of wife-beating, and male-dominated financial decision-making were additional risk factors for sexual violence (Gage 2005).

Chen and White (2004) found that earlier problem drinking and negative affect were common predictors of perpetration for both men and women; while lower education and parental fighting predicted female and female perpetration respectively. Significant risk factors in China according to Parish et al. (2004) include sexual jealousy, patriarchal beliefs, low female contribution to household income, low male socioeconomic status, alcohol consumption and residence in regions other than the South and Southeast. McCloskey et al. (2005) found that gender inequality within sexual unions is associated with intimate partner violence in Tanzania.

This paper examines the views of men about the acceptability of wife battering with the intent of showing that men with low socioeconomic status will be more likely to hold on to traditional views about wife battering in Nigeria. Some social psychological and sociological theories have linked attitude and behaviour together. Hence, to eradicate intimate partner violence in any society, traditional attitudes that significantly predict such behaviour must be the target of intervention programmes.

Data and Methods

This paper uses the latest of the Demographic and Health Survey in Nigeria (NDHS). It is a secondary data and the sample for the 2003 NDHS was designed to provide estimates of population and health indicators for Nigeria as a whole, urban and rural area, and six major subdivisions. A representative probability sample of 7,864 households was selected for the 2003

NDHS sample. The sample was selected in two stages. In the first stage, 365 clusters were selected from a list of enumeration area developed from the 1991 population census. In the second stage, a complete listing of households was carried out in each selected cluster. Households were then systematically selected for participation in the survey. All men age 15-59 were eligible to be interviewed if they were either permanent residents or visitors present in the household on the night before the survey. The fieldwork for the 2003 NDHS took place over a five-month period, from March to August 2003 and twelve interviewing teams carried out the data collection. The data entry and editing was completed in September 2003. Of the 2,572 eligible men identified, 91 per cent were successfully interviewed (National Population Commission and ORC Macro 2004).

Analyses

The analyses in this paper was done using STATA analytical package, and simple descriptive statistics, correlation and logistic regression model was used to answer the various questions, objectives and hypotheses put up in this paper. Some of the independent variables used in this paper are age, region, type of place of residence, childhood place of residence, type of place of previous residence, highest educational level, religious affiliation, literacy, frequency of reading newspaper or magazine, frequency of listening to radio, frequency of watching television, current marital status, number of unions, wealth index, current working status, occupation and other questions relating to gender power relation. The dependent variable is a wife battering composite score generated from the responses to questions on justification for wife battering and categorised into three basic responses, that is, those saying no to wife battering on all counts (modern view/idea), those having mixed view/idea are those tolerating wife battering for some of the reasons stated and those with traditional view/idea are those justifying wife battering on all the questions put forth in the survey. The questions asked are as follows: "Sometimes a husband is annoyed or angered by things that his wife does. In your opinion, is a husband justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations: If she goes out without telling him?, If she neglects the children?, If she argues with him?, If she refuses to have sex with him?, If she burns the food?, If food is not cooked on time?". Six point scales were generated using the afore-mentioned questions. A respondent obtains zero if he/she said "no" or "don't know" to all the six questions and six points if a respondent said "yes" to all the six questions.

Multinomial logistics regression is used in this paper because of the nature of the outcome variable and the general model is of the form stated below:

$P_w(y|x) = \exp w.f(x,y) / Z_w(x)$; where $Z_w(x) = \sum_y \exp w.f(x,y)$ and w is the weight vector corresponding to class.

Multinomial logistic regression model is a generalisation of logistic regression to outcomes with more than two categories, and it proceeds by comparing the effect of covariates on the possibility of being in each of $n-1$ categories compared with a baseline category.

Results

Profile of the Respondents

Table 1: A table showing the distribution of the respondents by background characteristics (NDHS 2003)

| Background Variables | Percent (Frequency) |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Age (5-year age group) | |
| 15-19 | 19.31 (453) |
| 20-24 | 18.80 (441) |
| 25-29 | 14.32 (336) |
| 30-34 | 11.94 (280) |
| 35-39 | 8.65 (203) |
| 40-44 | 8.78 (206) |
| 45-49 | 7.12 (167) |
| 50-54 | 5.71 (134) |
| 55-59 | 5.37 (126) |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Region | |
| North-Central | 17.73 (416) |
| North-East | 18.03 (423) |
| North-West | 23.32 (547) |
| South-East | 11.30 (265) |
| South-South | 13.34 (313) |
| South-West | 16.28 (382) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Type of Place of Residence | |
| Urban | 42.03 (986) |
| Rural | 57.97 (1,360) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| De facto Place of Residence | |
| Capital/Large City | 24.00 (563) |
| Small City | 15.90 (373) |
| Town | 19.31 (453) |
| Countryside | 40.79 (957) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Childhood Place of Residence | |
| City | 16.50 (387) |
| Town | 26.99 (633) |
| Countryside | 56.50 (1,325) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,345) |
| Type of Place of Previous Residence | |
| City | 30.59 (335) |
| Town | 37.81 (414) |
| Countryside | 31.60 (346) |
| Total | 100.00 (1,095) |
| Highest Educational Level | |
| No Formal Education | 21.01 (493) |
| Primary Education | 25.75 (604) |
| Secondary Education | 41.18 (966) |
| Higher | 12.06 (283) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Religious Affiliation | |
| Catholic | 15.90 (373) |
| Protestants | 15.90 (373) |
| Other Christians | 18.58 (436) |
| Islam/Moslem | 47.95 (1,125) |
| Traditionalists | 1.28 (30) |
| Others | 0.38 (9) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Literacy | |
| Can not read at all | 21.28 (499) |
| Able to read only parts of a sentence | 9.77 (229) |
| Able to read a whole sentence | 63.97 (1,500) |
| No card with required language | 4.99 (117) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,345) |
| Current marital status | |
| Never married | 46.46 (1,090) |
| Married | 48.64 (1,141) |
| Living together | 2.34 (55) |
| Widowed | 0.55 (13) |
| Divorced | 1.07 (25) |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Not living together (separated) | 0.94 (22) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Number of Unions | |
| Once | 61.15 (768) |
| More than once | 38.85 (488) |
| Total | 100.00 (1,256) |
| Respondent's Currently Working? | |
| No | 30.09 (704) |
| Yes | 69.91 (1,636) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,340) |
| Respondent's Occupation | |
| Not working/unemployed | 27.20 (638) |
| Professional/Technical/Managerial | 11.04 (259) |
| Clerical | 0.81 (19) |
| Sales | 13.26 (311) |
| Agricultural-self employed | 28.47 (668) |
| Household and Domestic | 0.13 (3) |
| Skilled manual | 15.22 (357) |
| Unskilled | 3.88 (91) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Worked in the last 12 months | |
| No | 26.44 (614) |
| In the past year | 3.10 (72) |
| Currently working | 70.46 (1,636) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,322) |
| Type of earnings for work | |
| Not paid | 20.82 (351) |
| Cash only | 61.45 (1,036) |
| Cash and Kind | 13.11 (221) |
| Kind only | 4.63 (78) |
| Total | 100.00 (1,686) |
| Wealth Index | |
| Poorest | 18.03 (423) |
| Poorer | 16.75 (393) |
| Middle | 18.97 (445) |
| Richer | 22.46 (527) |
| Richest | 23.79 (558) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine | |
| Not at all | 49.47 (1,159) |
| Less than once a week | 22.07 (517) |
| At least once a week | 19.21 (450) |
| Almost everyday | 9.26 (217) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,343) |
| Frequency of listening to radio | |
| Not at all | 5.55 (130) |
| Less than once a week | 8.58 (201) |
| At least once a week | 18.36 (430) |
| Almost everyday | 67.51 (1,581) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,342) |
| Frequency of watching Television | |
| Not at all | 32.98 (773) |
| Less than once a week | 21.89 (513) |
| At least once a week | 18.05 (423) |
| Almost everyday | 27.09 (635) |

| | |
|-------|----------------|
| Total | 100.00 (2,344) |
|-------|----------------|

The figures in parentheses are frequencies

Note: Some of the frequencies do not add up to the overall total either as a result of missing values or because it is a follow up question.

Table 1 reveals that the respondents are relatively young as 52.43% are below the age of 30 and 47.57% are 30 years and above. More than half of the respondents live in the rural area (57.97%) and reported countryside as their childhood place of residence (56.50%). About thirty-two percent of the respondents lived previously in the countryside, 37.81% in towns and 30.59% in cities. Twenty-one percent of the respondents had no formal education, 25.75% had primary education, 41.18% had secondary education and only 12.06% had beyond secondary education. A larger percentage of the respondents were Moslems (47.95%), followed by Christians whether protestants or other Christians (34.48%). About one fifth of the respondents are illiterates who can not read at all (21.28%). Fifty-one percent of them were currently married while about 3% were formerly married, and more than a third have had more than one union in their lifetime (38.85%). Seventy percent were currently working at the time of the survey with agricultural-self employment as the major occupation (28.47%) followed by the unemployed group (27.20%), skilled manual (15.22%) and sales (13.26%). Majority of the men under study work for cash only (61.45%) while only 4.63% received their remuneration in kind only. Analysis of the wealth index reveals a somewhat even distribution over the five wealth index categories. Twenty-four percent were categorised as falling within the richest group, followed by those in the richer category (22.46%), while 16.75% were categorised as belonging to the poorer group and 18.03% in the poorest category. Half of the respondents never read newspaper or magazine (49.47%) with only 9.26% reading it almost everyday. Sixty-eight percent and 27.09% listen to radio and watch television almost everyday respectively.

Table 2: A table showing the distribution of the respondents by gender power relation question among Nigerian men (NDHS 2003)

| Gender Power Relation | Percent (Frequency) |
|---|---------------------|
| Portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay | |
| None, income is saved | 0.48 (6) |
| Almost none | 3.43 (43) |
| Less than half | 20.67 (259) |
| About half | 20.11 (252) |
| More than half | 31.76 (398) |
| All | 23.54 (295) |
| Total | 100.00 (1,253) |
| Who had the final say on making large household purchases | |
| Respondent alone | 80.82 (1,896) |
| Respondent and wife/partner | 15.52 (364) |
| Wife/Partner alone | 1.28 (30) |
| Don't Know | 2.39 (56) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Who had the final say on making household purchases for daily needs | |
| Respondent alone | 48.68 (1,142) |
| Respondent and wife/partner | 10.78 (253) |
| Wife/Partner alone | 37.77 (886) |
| Don't Know | 2.77 (65) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Who had the final say on visits to family or relatives | |
| Respondent alone | 63.00 (1,476) |
| Respondent and wife/partner | 32.18 (754) |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Wife/Partner alone | 2.69 (63) |
| Don't Know | 2.13 (50) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,343) |
| Who had the final say on deciding what to do with money wife earns | |
| Respondent alone | 40.72 (955) |
| Respondent and wife/partner | 26.23 (615) |
| Wife/Partner alone | 29.85 (700) |
| Don't Know | 3.20 (75) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,345) |
| Who had the final say on deciding how many children to have | |
| Respondent alone | 43.21 (1,012) |
| Respondent and wife/partner | 45.13 (1,057) |
| Wife/Partner alone | 2.86 (67) |
| Don't Know | 8.80 (206) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,342) |

The figures in parentheses are frequencies

Note: Some of the frequencies do not add up to the overall total either as a result of missing values or because it is a follow up question.

Table 2 above reveals the pattern of gender power relation among men and women and it is basically patriarchal in nature in the sense that, men are the major decision-makers in family-related, productive and reproductive issues. The results show that for a fifth of the respondents, their earnings pay less than half or about half of the portion of household expenditures (20.67% and 20.11% respectively), 31.76% pay more than half and about a quarter pay all portions of household expenditures (23.54%). Eighty-one per cent of the men respondents solely have the final say on making large household purchases; 48.68% of decisions about making household purchases for daily needs; 63% of decisions about visits to family or relatives; 40.72% of decisions regarding what to do with money wife earns and 43.21% of decisions regarding number of children to have. Forty-five per cent of decisions regarding the number of children to have were jointly taken by the respondents and their partners. This shows a kind of openness among couples as Nigerian society is tending toward a more egalitarian society.

Table 3: A table showing the acceptability of wife battery among Nigerian men (NDHS 2003)

| Justification for Wife Battering | Percent (Frequency) |
|--|----------------------------|
| Wife beating justified if she goes out without telling the husband/partner | |
| No | 64.83 (1,521) |
| Yes | 28.09 (659) |
| Don't Know | 7.08 (166) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife beating justified if she neglects the children | |
| No | 66.62 (1,563) |
| Yes | 28.56 (670) |
| Don't Know | 4.82 (113) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife beating justified if she argues with husband/partner | |
| No | 68.54 (1,608) |
| Yes | 24.42 (573) |
| Don't Know | 7.03 (165) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife beating justified if she refuses to have sex with the husband/partner | |
| No | 70.08 (1,644) |

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Yes | 21.27 (499) |
| Don't Know | 8.65 (203) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife beating justified if she burns the food | |
| No | 80.05 (1,878) |
| Yes | 15.39 (361) |
| Don't Know | 4.56 (107) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife beating justified if the food is not cooked on time | |
| No | 78.72 (1,846) |
| Yes | 16.80 (394) |
| Don't Know/It depends | 4.48 (105) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,345) |
| Wife Battery Raw Scores (Composite score) | |
| 0 | 58.18 (1,365) |
| 1 | 10.44 (245) |
| 2 | 7.84 (184) |
| 3 | 6.10 (143) |
| 4 | 5.71 (134) |
| 5 | 3.67 (86) |
| 6 | 8.06 (189) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |
| Wife Battering Scores (categorical) | |
| Modern Views/Ideas | 58.18 (1,365) |
| Mixed Views/Ideas | 33.76 (792) |
| Traditional Views/Ideas | 8.06 (189) |
| Total | 100.00 (2,346) |

The figures in parentheses are frequencies

Note: One of the frequencies does not add up to the overall total as a result of missing values.

Table 3 reveals the acceptability of wife battering among Nigerian men. Twenty-eight per cent of the men interviewed believed that wife-beating is justified if the wife goes out without taking permission from the husband/partner, if the wife neglects the children (28.56%), if the wife argues with husband/partner (24.42%), if the wife refuses to have sex with husband/partner (21.27%), if the wife burns the food (15.39%), and if the food is not cooked on time (16.80%). It is also clear from the table that 58.18% of the respondents disagreed totally with wife-beating on all the questions raised which translates to people holding on to modern views/ideas about the acceptability of wife battering. Less than a tenth of the respondents were holding on to traditional views/ideas regarding wife-beating in the study (8.06%). This is an indication of major strides toward gender equality in Nigeria.

Bivariate Analysis

Table 4: A table showing the correlation/association between the various independent variables and attitude to wife battering among Nigerian men (NDHS 2003)

| Selected Independent Variables | Correlation Coefficient |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Age | -0.1122** |
| Region | -0.1146** |
| Type of Place of Residence | 0.1289** |
| Childhood Place of Residence | 0.1224** |
| Type of Place of Previous Residence | 0.0520 |
| Highest Educational Level | -0.0838** |
| Religious Affiliation | -0.0618** |
| Literacy | -0.1324** |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine | -0.1386** |
| Frequency of listening to radio | -0.1002** |
| Frequency of watching television | -0.1574** |
| Current marital status | -0.0589** |
| Number of Unions | 0.0646* |
| Have ever been married | -0.0152 |
| Wealth Index | -0.2258** |
| Respondent Currently Working? | -0.0502* |
| Respondent's Occupation | 0.0192 |
| Worked in the last 12 months | -0.0492* |
| Type of earnings for work | -0.1491** |
| Portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay | -0.0814** |
| Who had the final say on making large household purchases | -0.0644** |
| Who had the final say on making household purchases for daily needs | 0.0005 |
| Who had the final say on visits to family or relatives | -0.0706** |
| Who had the final say on deciding what to do with money wife earns | -0.1434** |
| Who had the final say on deciding how many children to have | -0.0244 |

**P<0.01; *P<0.05

Table 4 above shows the association between the selected independent variables and the outcome variable (Attitude toward wife battering). The results show that type of place of previous residence, whether the respondents have ever been married, respondent's occupation, the decision-maker on household purchases for daily needs, and the decision-maker on the number of children to have are the only insignificant independent variables associated with attitude toward wife battering in the study area. Also, type of place of residence, childhood place of residence, type of place of previous residence, number of unions, respondent's occupation, and the decision-maker on household purchases for daily needs were all positively correlated with attitude to wife battering while others were negatively correlated. Age is negatively associated with attitudes toward wife battering as seen in the table above.

Multivariate Analysis

Table 5: A table showing the multinomial logistic regression model of the predictors of attitude toward wife battering among Nigerian Men (NDHS 2003)

| Variables | Mixed Views/Ideas | | Traditional Views/Ideas | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| | Coefficient | Odd Ratio | Coefficient | Odd Ratio |
| Age | -0.05 (0.04) | 0.952396 | -0.05 (0.10) | 0.950326 |
| Region | 0.00 (0.05) | 1.003948 | -0.18 (0.12) | 0.837309 |
| Type of Place of Residence | 0.18 (0.19) | 1.191361 | 0.05 (0.43) | 1.047974 |
| Childhood Place of Residence | 0.00 (0.12) | 1.000792 | 0.29 (0.30) | 1.33507 |
| Highest Educational Level | 0.02 (0.11) | 1.01635 | 0.13 (0.25) | 1.13863 |
| Religious Affiliation | -0.16* (0.07) | 0.856333 | 0.01 (0.16) | 1.011354 |
| Literacy | -0.29** (0.11) | 0.750865 | 0.11 (0.25) | 1.121041 |
| Frequency of reading newspaper or magazine | -0.04 (0.10) | 0.964602 | 0.01 (0.23) | 1.011891 |
| Frequency of listening to radio | 0.05 (0.10) | 1.049479 | -0.25 (0.21) | 0.780548 |
| Frequency of watching | | 0.75857 | | 1.169578 |

| | | | | |
|--|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| television | -0.28** (0.09) | | 0.16 (0.20) | |
| Current marital status | 0.17 (0.10) | 1.188075 | 0.11 (0.22) | 1.117411 |
| Number of Unions | 0.39* (0.17) | 1.475859 | -0.42 (0.42) | 0.659171 |
| Wealth Index | 0.07 (0.08) | 1.073887 | -0.51** (0.19) | 0.601132 |
| Respondent Currently working | -0.23 (0.73) | 0.793241 | -1.23 (0.99) | 0.292866 |
| Type of earnings for work | -0.44* (0.22) | 0.64274 | -1.60** (0.56) | 0.20264 |
| Portion of household expenditures respondent's earnings pay | 0.05 (0.07) | 1.050423 | -0.53** (0.16) | 0.587826 |
| Who had the final say on making large household purchases | -0.13 (0.11) | 0.880093 | -0.06 (0.22) | 0.94645 |
| Who had the final say on visits to family or relatives | -0.08 (0.11) | 0.927166 | -0.21 (0.29) | 0.811682 |
| Who had the final say on deciding what to do with money wife earns | -0.06 (0.05) | 0.945249 | -0.09 (0.13) | 0.914376 |
| Constant | 0.39 (1.12) | 1.478933 | 4.79 (2.17) | 119.7022 |
| N | 792 | | 189 | |

*P<0.05; **P<0.01

Total N= 2,346; Standard errors in parentheses

Notes: Reference category for the equation is modern view regarding wife battering

The results of the multinomial logistic regression in table 5 show that region, type of place of residence, childhood place of residence, highest educational level, frequency of listening to radio, current marital status, number of unions, wealth index, portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay indicate an increased chance that a Nigerian man will have mixed views or ideas about wife battering compared to modern views or ideas. Also, type of place of residence, childhood place of residence, highest educational level, religious affiliation, literacy, frequency of reading newspaper or magazine, frequency of watching television, and current marital status indicate an increased chance that a man in Nigeria will hold on to traditional ideas about wife battering compared to modern ideas.

Religious affiliation, number of unions, type of earnings for work (P<0.05); literacy and frequency of watching television (P<0.01) were significant predictors of holding on to mixed views about wife battering compared to modern views, while wealth index, type of earnings for work and portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay significantly predict that Nigerian men will hold on to traditional ideas about wife battering when compared to modern views (P<0.01). At the multivariate level, age is not a significant variable as far as men's attitudes toward wife battering is concerned.

Discussion

Intimate partner violence (IPV) of which wife battering is a subset has been identified as a public health issue because physical and sexual abuse lie behind some of the most intractable and preventable reproductive health issues of our times- unwanted pregnancies, HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, and complications of pregnancy. The results indicated that men's socioeconomic status affect their attitude to wife battering in the study area and confirmed the hypotheses put forth in this paper, that men's low socioeconomic status operationalised as less education, low-skilled occupation, living in the rural areas and the fact that an individual lived in the countryside during their childhood and so on will predispose them to traditional and patriarchal attitudes about wife-beating.

More than half of the respondents live in the rural area (57.97%) and reported countryside as their childhood place of residence (56.50%). Rural areas are always associated with traditional and

patriarchal attitudes and may be one of the reasons for higher incidence of intimate partner violence. The highest percentage of men under the study had secondary education (41.18%) and it is generally believed and established that the higher the level of education, the more likely that they will be open to modern views concerning wife battering. This is due to the fact that highly educated men will be more enlightened and have respect for women's right which is essentially human right. Men who identify with any religion that justify wife-beating will likely hold on to traditional attitudes concerning such issue. Although, some Christian husbands or partners beat their wives when they are annoyed, the Christian Holy Book says "He that spares his rod hates his son: but he that loves him chastens him betimes", and there is no place where wife battering was justified in the Scriptures.

Illiteracy is closely related to low educational level and the result indicates that about one fifth of the respondents are illiterates and they will be more likely to hold on to traditional ideas compared to the literate ones. More than a third of the men under study have had more than one union in their lifetime (38.85%), and for some of them, intimate partner violence which had led to separation or divorce and remarriage may be responsible for their being in more than one union. Major occupations for the men are agricultural-self employment as the major occupation (28.47%) followed by skilled manual (15.22%) and sales (13.26%). Twenty-seven per cent of the men were unemployed at the time of the survey. Being unemployed has been found to be one of the risk factors for intimate partner violence as reported earlier since in a patriarchal setting, such men if married to working women may pick up quarrel with them over money issue, especially if they are resistant against such men controlling their money. There is the possibility of unemployed men having the final say on decisions regarding how the money wife earns will be spent. The most effective way of reaching men from the results of the analysis is radio (68%) followed by television and lastly through newspapers or magazines. Appropriate interventions must take into consideration the best ways to reach men with useful information that will produce attitudinal change in them.

Furthermore, the pattern of gender power relation among men and women is typically patriarchal in nature. Decision-making pattern shows that men dominate when it comes to decision on making large household purchases (81%); decisions about making household purchases for daily needs (48.68%); decisions about visits to family or relatives (63%); decisions regarding what to do with money wife earns (40.72%) and decisions regarding number of children to have (43.21%). These show that men are still powerful forces to reckon with when it comes to decisions within the family. Enlightening men rather than neglecting them will be of immense benefit to the achievement of population policy goals and objectives in general, and the eradication of domestic violence in particular.

In addition, wife battering is still justified for some reasons among some Nigerian men and these groups of men should be the target of intervention. They should be reached with appropriate information, education and communication (IEC) programmes. It is also clear from the results that more than half of the men under study (58.18%) disagreed totally with wife-beating on all the questions raised which translates to people holding on to modern views/ideas about the acceptability of wife battering. Less than a tenth of the respondents were holding on to traditional views/ideas regarding wife-beating in the study (8.06%). Although, the percentage of those holding on to traditional ideas seems small, they should not be overlooked for the good of the women folk.

Lastly, the results of associations show that type of place of previous residence, whether the respondents have ever been married, respondent's occupation, the decision-maker on household purchases for daily needs, and the decision-maker on the number of children to have are the only insignificant independent variables associated with attitude toward wife battering in the study area. Others were either positively or negatively correlated with attitude to wife battering. Religious affiliation, number of unions, type of earnings for work ($P < 0.05$); literacy and frequency of watching television ($P < 0.01$) were significant predictors of holding on to mixed views about wife battering compared to modern views, while wealth index, type of earnings for work and portion of household expenditures respondents' earnings pay significantly predict that Nigerian men will hold on to traditional ideas about wife battering when compared to modern views ($P < 0.01$).

Limitations

The following limitations are hereby identified: First, secondary data were used for the analyses in this paper and errors relating to missing data are inherent in the data. Also, questions that would have provided more insights in this paper such as “Have you ever been beaten, slapped or kicked by your intimate partner in your life?”, “Have you ever been beaten, slapped or kicked by your intimate partner in the past year?”, “How many times have you ever been beaten, slapped or kicked by your intimate partner in your lifetime or in the past year?” were not collected and could not be generated. Second, this paper could not estimate the level of wife battering in the country because there were no direct questions on whether the respondents had been beaten by their husbands/partners within a given reference period to the time of the survey as was identified earlier. An attempt is only being made to relate some selected independent variables to wife battering composite scores (later categorised into three variables). The composite scores were generated from a combination of questions asked about the attitude of men to wife battering or the acceptability of wife battering. Lastly, analyses in this paper rest on a cross-sectional data of a representative sample of men in Nigeria. However, the author’s ability to infer causal relationships is hampered due to the fact that the data is not a longitudinal one.

Conclusion

Results of the analysis for this paper indicated that men’s demographic and socioeconomic status correlated significantly with the kind of attitude they hold concerning wife battering in the study area. Men with low socioeconomic backgrounds were more likely to hold on to traditional views/ideas about wife-beating and the higher the socioeconomic standing of the men, the more likely that they will disagree with wife-beating completely. If the men believe that wife-beating is justified for some reasons, they will likely continue to perpetrate the act in the future. Hence, this paper concludes that improving the socioeconomic status of men in Nigeria can help to hasten the goal of eradicating intimate partner violence. This can be done by providing more opportunities for men to be educated and enlightened, creating employment opportunities which will enable men who are unemployed to be gainfully employed and economically buoyant. It is thought that these measures will enable men in Nigeria to be more open to the ideals of egalitarian-ness. Also, men in Nigeria, especially the less privileged ones, who are more likely to hold on to traditional ideas about wife-beating, need appropriate information, education and communication (IEC) programmes to enlighten them on the negative consequences of violence against women in general. Such interventions should be culture-sensitive, and should take into consideration the regional differences. Media houses can contribute meaningfully by passing useful information to the general populace concerning the negative consequences of domestic violence for the family and the society as a whole.

Acknowledgements

The author thank Measure Demographic and Health Survey (ORC Macro) for the data used in this paper, the three anonymous reviewers for their very useful comments and my advisor and mentor, Professor Clifford Odimegwu for both moral and financial support.

References

- Abdullah, R., Raj-Hashim, R., Schmitt, G. (1995): “Battered women in Malaysia: prevalence, problems and public attitudes”, Petaling, Malaysia, Women’s Aid Association, 1995.
- Adames, S.B. and Campbell, R. (2005): “Immigrant Latinas’ conceptualisations of intimate partner violence”, *Violence Against Women* 2005 Oct. 11(10): 1341-1364.
- Ahmed, S.M. (2005): “Intimate partner violence against women: experiences from a woman-focused development programme in Matlab, Bangladesh”, *Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition* 2005 Mar. 23(1): 95-101.
- Armstrong, A. (1998): “Culture and Choice: Lessons from survivors of gender violence in Zimbabwe”, Harare, Zimbabwe, Violence against Women in Zimbabwe Research Project, 1998.

- Bawah, A.A., Akweongo, P., Simmons, R., and Phillips, J.F., (1999): "Women's fears and men's anxieties: The impact of family planning on gender relations in northern Ghana", *Studies in Family Planning* 30 (1): 54-66. 1999.
- Bradley, C.S. (1985): "Attitudes and practices relating to marital violence among the Tolai of East New Britain". In: Toft, S., (ed.) *Domestic Violence in Papua New Guinea (PNG)*. Boroko, PNG, PNG Law Reform Commission 1985 P. 32-71.
- Bradley, C. (1988): "How can we help rural beaten wives? Some suggestions from Papua New Guinea", Paper presented at the International Welsh Women's Aid Conference, Cardiff, Wales.
- Chen, P.H. and White, H.R. (2004): "Gender differences in adolescent and young adult predictors of later intimate partner violence", *Violence Against Women* 2004 Nov. 10(11): 1283-1301.
- Choi, A., Edleson, J.L. (1996): "Social disapproval of wife assault: a national survey of Singapore", *Journal of Comparative family studies*, 1996, 28:73-88.
- Coker, A.L., Oldendick, R., Derrick, C. and Lumpkin, J. (2000): "Intimate partner violence among men and women—South Carolina, 1998", *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 2000 Aug. 4; 49(30): 691-4.
- Coker, A.L. & Richter, D.L. (1998): "Violence against women in Sierra Leone: frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence and forced sexual intercourse", *African Journal of Reproductive Health* 1998 Apr. 2(1): 61-72.
- David, F., and Chin, F. (1998): "Economic and Psychosocial influences of family planning on the lives of women in Western Visayas", Iloilo City, Philippines, Central Philippines University and Family Health International, June 1998.
- Dunkle, K.L., Jewkes, R.K., Brown, H.C., Gray, G.E. and McIntyre, J.A. (2004): "Gender-based violence, relationship power, and risk to HIV infection in women attending antenatal clinics in South Africa", *Lancet* 2004 May 1; 363(9419): 1415-1421.
- El-Zanaty, F., Hussein, E.M., Shawky, G.A., Way, A.A. and Kishor, S. (1996): "Egypt demographic and health survey 1995", Calverton, Maryland, Macro International, 1996. 348p.
- Fathalla, M. (2005): "When home is no longer safe: intimate partner violence", *Lancet* 2005 Dec. 3; 366(9501): 1910-1911.
- Gage, A.J. (2005): "Women's experience of intimate partner violence in Haiti", *Social Science and Medicine* 2005; 61: 343-364.
- Ganju, D., Jejeebhoy, S., Nidadavolu, V., Santhya, K.G. and Finger, W. (2004): "Forced sexual relations among married young women in developing countries", New Delhi, India, Population Council, YouthNet, 2004 Jun. [4] p.
- Garcia-Moreno, C. et al. (2002): "Preliminary Results from the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence", Presentation at the World Conference on Injury, Montreal, Canada (May 2002).
- Glantz, N.M., Halperin, D.C. (1996): "Studying domestic violence: perceptions of women in Chiapas, Mexico", *Reproductive Health Matters*, 1996, 7: 122-128.
- Gonzalez, M.S. (1998): "Domestic violence in Cuetzalan, Mexico: Some research questions and results", Centre for Health and Gender Equity (CHANGE), ed. *Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the International Research Network on Violence Against Women*, Jan., 9-11, 1998. CHANGE, P. 36-41.
- Hassan, Y. (1995): "The haven becomes hell: A study of domestic violence in Pakistan". In Cantt, L. *Pakistan: Women Living Under Muslim Laws*. Aug. 1995. P.72.
- Heise, L. (1999): "Ending violence against women". *Population Reports, Series L, No.11* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health, Population Information Program (December 1999).
- Heise, L. & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2002): "Violence by intimate partners", In: *World report on violence and health*, Etienne G. Krug (eds.) Geneva, Switzerland, World Health Organisation [WHO], 2002.: 87-121.
- Hindin, M.J. (2003): "Understanding women's attitudes towards wife beating in Zimbabwe", *Bulletin of the World Health Organisation* 2003 Jul. 81(7): 501-508.
- Hindin, M.J. & Adair, L.S. (2002): "Who's at risk? Factors associated with intimate partner violence in the Philippines", *Social Science and Medicine* 2002 Oct. 55(8): 1385-1399.
- Hollander, D. (2005): "Traditional gender roles and intimate partner violence linked in China", *International Family Planning Perspectives* 2005 Mar. 31(1): 46-47.

- Janet de Merode (1994): "Foreword" Pp. ix in Heise, L.L., Pitanguy, J., Germain, A., eds., "Violence against Women, The Hidden Health Burden", World Bank Discussion Papers, No. 255.
- Jejeebhoy, S. (1998): "Wife beating in rural India: a husband's right?", Economic and political weekly Mumbai, India, 1998.
- Khan, M.E., Townsend, J.W., Sinha, R., and Lakhanpal, S. (1996): "Sexual Violence within marriage". In: Seminar, New Delhi, Population Council 1996. p. 32-35.
- LLika, A.L., Okonkwo, P.I. and Adogu, P. (2002): "Intimate partner violence among women of childbearing age in a primary health care centre in Nigeria", African Journal of Reproductive Health 2002; 6(3): 53-58.
- McCloskey, L.A., Williams, C. & Larsen, U. (2005): "Gender inequality and intimate partner violence among women in Moshi, Tanzania", International Family Planning Perspectives 2005 Sep. 31(3): 124-130.
- Michau, L. (1998): "Community based research for social change in Mwanza, Tanzania". Centre for Health and Gender Equity (CHANGE) ed., Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the International Research Network on Violence Against Women, Washington D.C., Jan. 9-11, 1998. CHANGE, p. 4-9.
- Miranda, D. (1994): "Women and Violence: Realities and Responses Worldwide", Zed Books Ltd, London and New Jersey.
- Morrison, A., Ellsberg, M. and Bott, S. (2004): "Addressing gender-based violence in the Latin America and Caribbean Region: a critical review of interventions", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3438. Washington, D.C., World Bank, 2004 Oct. [77] p.
- National Sex and Reproduction Research Term and Jenkins, C. (1994): "National Study of Sexual and reproductive Knowledge and behaviour in Papua New Guinea (PNG). Goroka, PNG, PNG Institute of Medical Research, Mar. 1994.
- Njovana, E. & Watts, C. (1996): "Gender violence in Zimbabwe: a need for collaborative action. Reproductive Health Matters, 1996, 7:46-54.
- National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ORC Macro (2004): "Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2003", Calverton, Maryland: National Population Commission and ORC Macro.
- Omonubi-McDonnell, M. (2003): "Gender Inequality in Nigeria". Spectrum Books Limited.
- Osakue, G. and Hilber, A.M. (1998): "Women's sexuality and fertility in Nigeria" In: Petchesky, R. and Judd, K. Negotiating Reproductive Rights. London, Zed Books Ltd. 1998. P.180-216.
- Pallitto, C.C. & O'Campo, P. (2005): "Community-level effects of gender inequality on intimate partner violence and unintended pregnancy in Colombia: testing the feminist perspective", Social Science and Medicine 2005; 60: 2205-2216.
- Parish, W.L., Wang, T., Laumann, E.O., Pan, S. and Luo, Y. (2004): "Intimate partner violence in China: national prevalence, risk factors and associated health problems", International Family Planning Perspectives 2004; 30(4): 174-181.
- Population Reports (1999): "Ending Violence Against Women", Series L, Number 11, Volume XXVII, Number 4, December 1999.
- Rosales, O.J., Loaiza, E., Primante, D., Barberena, A., Blandon, S.L. and Ellsberg, M. (1998): "Nicaraguan demographic and health survey", 1999.
- Schuler, S.R., Hashemi, S.M., Riley, A.P., and Akhter, S. (1996): "Credit programs, patriarchy and men's violence", Science and medicine 43(12): 1729-1742. 1996.
- Tonelli, M. (2004): "Teens and intimate partner violence", Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology 2004; 17: 421-422.
- United Nations Economic and Social Council (1993): "Report of the Working Group on Violence against women", Vienna, United Nations, 1993 (E/CN.6/WG.2/1992/L.3).
- United Nations General Assembly (1993): "Declaration on the elimination of violence against women" Proceedings of the 85th Plenary Meeting, Geneva, December 20, 1993. United Nations General Assembly.
- United Nations Population Fund, (1999): "Violence against girls and women". New York, UNFPA, 1999. 24p.
- Verma, R.K. and Collumbien, M. (2003): "Wife beating and the link with poor sexual health and risk behaviour among men in urban slums in India", Journal of Comparative Family Studies 2003 Winter; 34(1): 61-74.

- Wood, and Jewkes, R. (1997): "Violence, rape and sexual coercion: Everyday love in South Africa", *Gender and Development* 5(2): 23-30. 1997.
- World Health Organization (1997): "Violence against women: A priority health issue" WHO/FRH/WHD/97.8, Geneva, WHO, Jul. 1997. Fact sheets.
- WHO (2005): "Violence related to gender and sexuality", *Progress in Reproductive Health Research* 2005; (67): 7.
- WHO (2006): "WHO Report: Intimate partner violence most common form of abuse against women worldwide", *Connections* 2006 Feb.; [2] p.
- Xu, X., Zhu, F., O'Campo, P., Koenig, M.A. and Mock, V. (2005): "Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in China", *American Journal of Public Health* 2005 Jan. 95(1): 78-85.
- Zimmerman, K. (1995): "Plates in a basket will rattle: Domestic violence in Cambodia: A summary", Phnom Penh, Cambodia, Project against Domestic Violence, 1995.