

Gender Based Violence in Akungba-Akoko of South Western Nigeria: Are Men Victimized?

Fayankinnu Emmanuel Abiodun
Department of Sociology
Adekunle Ajasin University
P.M.B. 001 Akungba-Akoko
Ondo State, Nigeria.
yahdammy@yahoo.com

Paper presented at the Fifth African Population Conference: Arusha, Tanzania 10-14 December, 2007

Gender Based Violence in Akungba-Akoko of South Western Nigeria: Are Men Victimized?

Fayankinnu Emmanuel Abiodun
Department of Sociology
Adekunle Ajasin University
P.M.B. 001 Akungba-Akoko
Ondo State, Nigeria.
yahdammy@yahoo.com

Abstract

The dynamics at understanding domestic violence (DV) instigated several studies, most of which treated the issue as a gender-specific problem – women are always the victims and men are always the perpetrators. Little or no population-based study has been conducted on DV meted toward men by women in Nigeria, thus, undermining the actual number of men who are in a domestic relationship in which they are abused or treated violently by women with implication on the social well being and psychological health of men. This paper attempt at identifying the forms of domestic violence men experience from women (intimate partner); the prevalence rate; consequences of the violence on men's social well being and psychological health.

The study design was a mix of qualitative and quantitative techniques. Ten focus group discussions (FGDs) (5 each) were conducted among married men and women. Systematic random sampling was used to select ever married men and women aged 15-49 years on whom structured questionnaires were administered. Qualitative and quantitative data collected were analyzed using content analysis and SPSS software respectively.

Findings revealed that 84.2% of the men reported to have experience at least an act of domestic violence. The responses from men and women indicate that Verbal/psychological (76% and 60.7%) and sexual violence (58.9% and 68.8%) are the two major forms of domestic violence experienced by Men in Akungba-Akoko. Rate of men's violation is at par with that of women but grossly under-reported. Correlation result showed that marriage type, religion, occupational status, gender of child and knowledge of partner's involvement in extramarital affair are likely indicators responsible to the chances of men experiencing domestic violence. Results from the FGDs indicate that men who have experienced one form of domestic violence are likely to manifest low social and psychological health; have extra marital affairs making them susceptible to STIs and HIV/AIDs; and alienated from self identity.

The paper concludes that more attention be given to domestic violence experienced by men; seminars on family issues be organized to orientate couples; the family institution should improve on the process of socializing the child; more researches be conducted in the areas of violence meted towards men by women; socio-cultural beliefs that suppose men can not be violated be abandoned and government should enact policies that sanctions women who violates men.

KeyWords: Verbal/Psychological Violence, Sexual Violence, Social Well being, Psychological health.

Introduction

The incidence of domestic violence (DV) is one of the most prevalent social phenomena that characterize the family system and demand urgent attention. In the distant as well as past recently, attempt to understand the dynamics of DV generated several studies most of which treated the issue as a gender-specific problem – women are always the victims and men are always the perpetrators (Akinbulumo, 2003; Koenig, Hossan, Ahmed, and Haagar, 2003; Jewkes, Penn-Kekana, 2001; Odimegwu, 2000; Koenig, Hossan, Ahmed, and Haagar, 1999; Jejeebhoy and Cook, 1997; Galindo, 1994; Dobash, 1992; Schwartz, 1987; Quarm and Schartz, 1985; McLeod, 1984; Kincaid, 1982; Gaquin, 1977). It appears little or no study has been conducted on domestic violence meted toward men by women in Nigeria. In fact, the few studies conducted in this area are limited to advanced developed countries (ADC) thus, undermining the actual number of men who are in intimate partner relationships in which they are abused or treated violently by women, with implications for their psychological health and social well-being (Straus, 1997; Gelles and Straus, 1990; Steinmetz, 1978).

Among other reasons that account for this neglect is the fact that men seldom report DV and, this makes it difficult to obtain reliable statistics (Straus, 1997). This is in sharp contrast to the case of women whose many years of advocacy and official support have encouraged them to report DV. Thus, men have not been encouraged to report (domestic) abuse against them by women. In this light, we may ask: are men not equally abused as women in the family? Second, the cultural belief that men could be victims of DV is as unimaginable as it is ridiculous such that many men tend to decline reporting. This raises the question of why should it be unthinkable that men could be victims of DV by women? Third, the pattern, manifestation, purpose, motives and experience of DV tend to differ between men and women. Researches have demonstrated that often times, while physical assault/damage resulting to injury inflicted by men is much greater than the physical harm inflicted by women; psychological/emotional/verbal violence inflicted by women is greater than the psychological assault inflicted by men (Vissing, Straus, Gelles, and Harrop, 1991; Steinmetz, 1978). Given this difference in the experience of DV from gender to gender, when women abuse men, it is usually subtle, unnoticed, and less likely

to be brought to the attention of others. Thus, another question emerges: what implications are there for men who are victims of psychological/verbal abuse (usually perpetrated by women)? Since men experience more of psychological/emotional abuse from women, can it be said that such abuse is less significant in its impact on the social well-being of men compared to that of women who suffer more of physical abuse from men?

The broad objective of this paper is to demonstrate that within the family system, men do not constitute the sole perpetrator of DV, as widely assumed; men are equally victims of (domestic) abuse in the hands of women. The study's specific objectives include;

- i) To determine if men who are in an intimate partner relationships experience abuse from their partners.
- ii) To identify the type and pattern of DV against men by their partners, especially women.
- iii) To examine the relationship between the demographic characteristics of men in relation to their experiences of DV
- iv) To identify the effects of domestic violence on men.

Hypothesis

- i) There is no correlation between respondent's demographic characteristics- type of marriage, religion, educational qualification, occupational status, children gender, and extra marital affairs- and DV.

Review of the literature

After so many years of neglect, domestic violence (DV) in intimate partner relationships has been receiving more attention as a serious problem, from the early 1970s (Datton, 1995). Thenceforth, however, the debate on DV has been controversial, particularly the issue of whether women are violent toward men. Thus, two paradigms to the debate have emerged: the Violence-Against-Women (radical feminist) perspective; and, the Family-Violence perspective. Proponents of the former argue that women and not men constitute victims of violence in the family. In other words, spouse-assault is conceived to be exclusively male-perpetrated or that female intimate partner violence, to the extent that it existed at all, was defensive or inconsequential (Jafe, Lemon, & Poisson, 2003; Elles and Dekeseredy, 1996; Kurz; 1995; Yllo, 1993; Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Daly and Wilson, 1988). In contrast, advocates of the family-violence perspective are concerned with the issue of 'spousal abuse' and 'family violence'. These researchers contend that both women and men are violent (Kessler et al., 2001, Nicholls & Dutton, 2001; Straus, 1997; Gelles, 1993; McNeely and Mann, 1990; Straus and Gelles, 1990; Stets, 1990; Brinkerhoff and Lupri, 1988; Gelles and Straus, 1988; McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987; Shupe, Stacey, and Hazel-wood, 1987; Gelles and Cornell, 1985). In fact, some of these researchers argue that women initiate and carry out physical assaults on their partners as often as men do (Straus, 1997).

In the light of the foregoing, the review that follows cut across both perspectives, with the objective of establishing that men are equally victims of DV in the hands of their intimate partners. The United States (US) National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), constitute one of the evidence frequently used to debunk data showing similar rates of violence perpetrated by men and women. Using data from the NCVS, Dobash and Dobash (1992), reported that in 90-95 per cent of cases of assault within the family context, women constitute the victims of male violence. In a similar study of married couples, Schwartz (1987) found that 96 per cent of wives reported to be victims at the hands of their husbands while only 4 per cent of men indicated to have been abused by their wives.

In their study of rate of aggression committed by men and women, Tjaden & Thoennes (1998), reported 'women experience significantly more partner violence than

men do'. Specifically, the result of the study showed that 22.1% women compared to 7.4% men reported any physical assault by an intimate partner across their life time; 1.3% of women reported physical assault by a partner in the previous twelve months.

Statistic Canada (2000) aimed at correcting the anomaly of under-detection of family violence inherent with past crime surveys by asking direct questions associated with family violence victimization among a sample of 26,000 people aged above 16 and in an annual random digit telephone survey called the General Social Survey (GSS). Statistics Canada's rationale is stated in a 1999 report. Given that the GSS directed questions to the sample as regards their personal crime experiences, it was able to obtain information on crimes reported to the police as well as those unreported. A defect of this rationale is that the focus of government on DV has been of conceptualizing wife assault as a crime, and considering violence against men as inconsequential, even to the extent of police reluctance to arrest (Brown, 2004). The combination of police reluctance with men's reluctance to acknowledge victimization raises the question of whether men would perceive female-violence against them as crimes. Hence, Brown (2004) observed that the GSS (1999) indicated that men (81.3%) were less willing to respond to the survey than were women. Walby & Allen (2004) reported a similar finding in their study on victims of DV in the UK. According to their report, the male respondents did not report injuries involving them; men were less likely to have told anyone about the victimization than were women; and 64% of the men sampled did not perceive what occurred to them as a crime.

Statistics on the pattern of injury reveal that women, more than men, sustain injuries in conflicts between husbands and wives. Accordingly, Berk (1983) reported that in most cases (95%) women suffer injuries compared to men. He argued further that in cases where both partners sustain injuries, women's injuries are nearly three times more severe than men. Similarly, Brush (1990) reported that women, rather than men, are more likely to be injured in disputes involving violent tactics.

In another study conducted on the rate of injury sustained by intimate partners, Bensley et al. (1998) found that 23.6% of women and 7.5% of men reported life-time experiences of intimate-partner violence; 21.6% of women and 7.5% of men reported

injuries. More women (18.8%), compared to men (6.2%), reported minor injuries; similarly, more women (7.4%) than men (1.7%) reported severe injuries.

Walby & Allen (2004), in their study of victims of DV in the UK, revealed that 89% women constitute victims subjected to more than four incidents of DV compared to 11% men. Further, 20% women reported to have suffered moderate injuries and 6% women suffered severe injuries.

Studies among divorcing couples establish that women usually are the targets of violence than men. In a study consisting 362 separated husbands and wives, Ellis and Stuckless (1993) revealed that over 40 per cent and 17 per cent of separating wives and husbands, respectively, mentioned to have been injured by their partners at some time during the relationship. There has been a high rate of abuse against women by men after separation. In fact, they argue that in addition to the greater risk of injury, women also stand a greater risk of death. Women stand the risk of being killed by their husbands after separation than when they were still living together (Wilson and Daly, 1993). Such wives are at a higher risk within the first two months of leaving a relationship.

In sum, studies conducted in line with the NCVS found that women are more victimized; women are less violent and more injured than men. These findings, however, have been challenged by the family-violence researchers. First, they argued that the procedure followed in conducting the NCVS was biased given that during the survey-interviews both partners were present. This is capable of affecting the rate at which victims respond particularly when fear of further violence is envisaged (Straus, 1997, 1990; Straus and Gelles, 1990, 1986). Second, the NCVS was presented to respondents as a crime study against women. Dutton and Nicholls (2005) observed that the NCVS contained 'filters' or demand characteristics that would make men less likely to report their own victimization. This methodological problem of the NCVS undermined some DV that require overt proof to be considered criminal. This suggests that domestic assaults that are injury free are less likely to be reported. By implication, the high rate of women-victims recorded by studies that toed the line of the NCVS was as a result of the fact that DV, such as psychological/emotional or verbal violence, which seldom result in physical injury and constitute the most experienced by men were not provided in the

NCVS. Hence, the instrument used for the NCVS was skewed towards women and tactfully hindered men from reporting their victimization.

Contrary to the findings of the NCVS, several independent studies have established that women are about the same rate violent as men; more likely to be injured than men; and to be arrested less often than men. In addition, men are more unlikely to consider themselves as victims; more unlikely to perceive an assault from a woman as a crime; and more unlikely to report victimization than women (Straus, 1997; Straus & Gelles, 1992; Tyree and Malone, 1991; Sorenson and Telles, 1991; Brush, 1990; Schulman, 1979; Scanzoni, 1978)

In the quest to understand the pattern of how victims report cases of DV, Straus and Gelles (1992) categorized violent rates on the basis of who did the reporting (whether men or women). The difference was highest for males under 25years- who under-report female-perpetrated violence compared to wives' reports of their own violence. On the other hand, the report for husbands' victimization accounted for only 72% of wives' perpetration reported for all assaults. Conversely, the perpetration-rate for husbands reported is 79% of wives' victimization-reports. Given this, if assumed that wives' perpetration reports may themselves be an under-representation, then men's' victimization-reports are grossly under represented. Wives' perpetrations are 208% of husband's victimization-reports" (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). An inference from the above finding is that both perpetration and victimization of severe violence were grossly under reported by men.

In another study, Brown (2004) found a wide gap in the pattern of arrest and prosecution of spousal assault as a function of gender. According to him, women were four times more likely to report partner violence to police. Stets and Straus (1992) reported earlier similar finding that women were 10 times more likely to call police in response to partner assault. Women were also more likely to make the police arrest when reporting (75%) than were men reporting (60%) an assault by women. When men sustain injuries, female perpetrators are arrested only 60.2% of the time, compared to 91.9% of cases involving the reverse situation (Brown, 2004).

Feminist experts on DV are agreed that women perpetrate violence but often in defense of themselves. Walker (1984) and Sanders (1988) toeing similar paths, argued

that women's violence is always self-defense, even where the woman utilizes severe violence and the man employs only mild violence. The reason for this, they argued, is because women are generally small in size and weight. Critically, this may not necessarily be the case as, sometimes women are bigger and weigh more than men. Walker (1984) and Sanders (1988) failed to provide an explanation for this. Again, there was defect in the data collected. For instance, the data did not ask who first perpetrated violence; thus, the issue of self-defense cannot be answered by that data set. In contrast to an earlier study, Bland and Orn (1986) asked their respondents who used violence first. The result showed that 73.4% of the female respondents affirmed to have used violence first. Stets and Straus (1992) also found similar trend in females striking first (52.7%) at their partners.

Deskeseredy & Schwartz (1998), in a study of young adults, reported that women (62.3%) submitted that violence perpetrated by them was not done in self-defense, while 6.9% said it was always in self-defense. Fiebert and Gonzalez (1997) studied 968 Californian college-age women on how they initiated physical assaults on their male partners. Twenty-nine per cent of the women reported to have initiated assaults during the past five years. The result also indicated that women in their 20's are significantly more aggressive than women aged 30 years and older. Generally, the inference from these studies is that it does not give credence to the notion that female violence is solely defensive; and, as such, feminists who argued in the contrary are biased.

Many other independent studies of gender differences and violence have been published. Against being presented as "crime victims" studies, they studied intimate violence as part of another research focus. George (1999) conducted a study on female-perpetrated assaults in the U.K from a sample of 1,455. He found that 14% of men reported greater victimization and more severe assaults than women (7%). The majority (55%) of assaults on men were perpetrated by spouses, partners, or former partners.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Vivain (1994) studied a clinic sample of 97 couples seeking marital counselling. Utilizing a modified version of the CTS, they found that 61% of the husbands and 64% of the wives were categorized as aggressive, 25% of the husbands and 11% of the wives were identified as mildly aggressive, and 36% of husbands and 53% of wives were found as severely aggressive. The result further show

that where a disagreement arises, 65% of husbands under-report aggression and 35% of husbands were over-reporting; while 57% of wives were under-reporting aggression and 43% of wives were over-reporting aggression.

In another study of how college-students abuse themselves, Hines and Saudino (2003) understudied college-students engaged in romantic relationships during the previous six months. The findings revealed that more females (35%), compared to males (29%) reported perpetrating physical aggression; more males (12.5%) than females (4.5%) said they received severe physical aggression; and, 14% of females constitute the sole perpetrator of aggression. The study did not find any significant relationship between gender differences in perpetration of either psychological aggression or severe physical aggression.

In their cross cultural study of partner violence consisting of 6,900 university undergraduates selected from seventeen countries, Douglas and Straus (2003) established that adolescents girls were more likely to assault male partners than adolescents boys were to assault female partners by an average of 115%. According to the report, assault that is severe is very likely to be female perpetrated in Scotland (552% of male rate), Singapore (457%), and New Zealand (296%) (Quoted in Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). The review indicate that men in intimate relationships are equally victimized by their partners.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted among ever and currently married men and women age 20-51 years and 15-49 years, respectively, in Akungba-Akoko, South-Western Nigeria.

The study-design was a mix of qualitative and quantitative techniques. For the qualitative aspect of the study, ten (10) Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) - 5 each - consisting of 8-10 participants per session were conducted among married men and women. To aid the discussions, an FGD guide was designed to contain questions relating to the acts of victimization men may experience; and, the implications of DV on men. On the other hand, quantitative data were collected through the administration of a carefully designed and validated questionnaire in a face-to-face interaction with the respondents. The questionnaire contained respondents' demographic characteristics, types of violence against men by their partners, and the likely predisposing-factors to DV.

A total of 258 respondents (men, 146; and women, 112) were systematically selected from a cluster of houses in Akungba. The houses were numbered serially to provide a sample frame for the study. The Nth method was used to select each of the sample units in which every 3rd house was selected. Caution was taken to ensure that none of the men respondents or the women respondents was married to each other. In other words, in all the houses selected, only one respondent was picked at a time. The justification for this is to guard against lop-sided findings. Previous studies have shown that when partners who experience family violence are interviewed together, responses may be hampered for fear of subsequent victimization by either of the parties.

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) is used to analyse quantitative data. Data analysed are presented in descriptive statistics, simple percentage and frequency distribution. The correlation test is used to relate variables. The FGDs are sorted, transcribed and analyzed using content analysis. Verbatim quotations of the respondents are made from the responses and presented in italics in the text. In addition, attempt is made to quantify some of the FGDs' results, where possible.

Findings

Two hundred and fifty eight respondents, consisting of one hundred and forty-six men and one hundred and twelve women were interviewed. Men between the ages of 20-51 years and women between the ages of 15-49 years were involved in the study. The mean age recorded for men is 39.14 years while for women it is 33.00 years. (see **Table I**)

Respondents' educational status showed that more than 85.3% respondents are literate. Men are however more likely to have a higher level of education than women. About 87% men respondents are literate as compared to 79.8% women. However, when specific educational level was taken into consideration, more women than men had primary education, but more men reported to have had secondary and tertiary education compared to the women. This variance is not surprising given that the Nigerian society is patriarchal, where preference to formal education is given to men than women. Analysis of the respondents' religious orientation shows that Christianity constitutes the single largest group of the respondents. This accounts for 69.8% of the total number of respondents. They are followed by Muslim respondents who make up 30.2%.

Ninety-four per cent of the all respondents are still married; 1.9 per cent is divorced; and 4.3 per cent have lost their partners due to death (widows/widower) reported to be divorced and widowed respectively. Almost 59% of the respondents are in monogamous unions. Men who reported monogamous unions make up the largest group among the respondents. Interestingly, a large proportion of the respondents, above 40%, indicated that they are in polygynous unions. In terms of respondents' occupational status, 82.2% of the total respondents reported to be employed while 17.8% indicated they are unemployed. However, more men (25.3%) reported being unemployed compared to the women (8.0%).

Table I Demographic Characteristic of Respondents

Sex	Educational Attainment				Total %
	No formal education	primary	secondary	Tertiary	
Men	19(13%)	40(27.4%)	51(34.9%)	36(24.7%)	146(100)
Women	19 (17%)	24(21.4%)	46(41.1%)	23(20.5%)	112 (100)
Total	38(14.7)	64(24.8)	97(37.6)	59(22.9)	258(100)

Sex	Religion		Total %
	<i>Christainity</i>	<i>Islam</i>	
Men	99(67.8%)	47(32.2%)	146(100)
Women	81(72.3%)	31(27.7%)	112(100)
Total	180(69.8)	78(30.2%)	258(100)

Sex	Marital Status			Total
	Married	Separated	Widow/widower	
Men	139(95.2%)	5(3.4%)	2(1.4%)	146(100)
Women	103(92.0%)		9(8.0%)	112(100)
Total	242 (93.8)	5(1.9)	11(14.3%)	258(100)

Sex	Marriage Type		Total %
	<i>Monogamy</i>	<i>Polygyny</i>	
Men	91(62.3%)	55(37.7%)	146(100)
Women	61(54.5%)	51(45.5%)	112(100)
Total	152(58.9)	106(41.1%)	258(100)

Sex	Occupational Status		Total %
	<i>Unemployed</i>	<i>Employed</i>	
Men	37(25.3%)	109(74.4%)	146(100)
Women	9(8.0%)	103(92.0%)	112(100)
Total	46(17.8%)	212(82.2%)	258(100)

Source: from author's survey

Are men victimized by their spouses or not? A large proportion (84.2%) of the men respondents affirmed to have experienced one form of DV from their partners. Interestingly, 71.4% of the women respondents indicated having perpetrated at least one form of DV against their partners. This suggests that both genders are potential perpetrators of DV. (*see table II & III*)

Asked the types and frequency of DV experienced by men aged 20-51 years in the last 12 months before the survey? The findings are that verbal/psychological violence (76%) and sexual violence (58.9%) constitute two major types of DV the men respondents experienced from their partners. In addition, 37.7% and 30.1% of the men respondents reported to have experienced both economic and Physical DV, respectively. In an attempt to guide against a lop-sided result, the women respondents were asked to indicate the nature of DV their partners. More than 67% of the women reported to have perpetrated verbal/psychological violence against their partners. This is followed by sexual violence (68.8%), economic violence (27.7%) and physical violence (25%). (**see table IV & V**)

Table II. Percentage distribution of men respondents according to if they experience DV in the last 12months

Have you experience DV from your partner in the last 12months	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	123	84.2
No	23	15.8
Total	146	100

Source: from author's survey

Table II. Percentage distribution of women respondents according to if they have perpetrated DV against their partner in the last 12 months

Have you experience DV from your partner in the last 12months	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	123	84.2
No	23	15.8
Total	146	100

Source: from author's survey

Table IV. Percentage distribution of men respondents and their experience of DV from their partners in the last 12months

	Frequency	Percentage
Verbal/Psychological (N=146)	111	76.0
Sexual (N=146)	86	58.9
Economic (N=146)	55	37.7
Physical (N=146)	44	30.1

Source: from author's survey

* These are multiple responses

Table V. Percentage distribution of women respondents according to perpetration of DV against their partners in the last 12months

	Frequency	Percentage
Verbal/Psychological Violence (N=112)	68	60.7
Sexual Violence (N=112)	77	68.8
Economic (N=112)	31	27.7
Physical (N=112)	28	25.0

Source: from author's survey

* These are multiple responses

Findings from the FGDs conducted with the men respondents show that some of the frequent acts of verbal/physical violence experienced by men are; being cursed/making demeaning remarks about them (38), challenging their authority (29), not receiving adequate attention (21), and public humiliation and making jokes at their expense (17). From the women FGDs, constant nagging (29), retorting and grumbling at their partners (22) and neglect of partners' feelings (18) constitute constant acts of verbal/psychological violence perpetrated against men.

In regard to acts of sexual violence the men experienced, FGDs conducted with men reveal the following; not being allowed to have sexual intercourse by their partners (31), being compelled to have sex when tired or ill (19), withdrawing when the man is about ejaculating (07), making jest about the man's penis size (14), and unpleasant jokes of men's sexual performance (22).

The FGDs also show men's experience of physical violence to include; being grabbed (28), hit with the fist, (13), and bitten (09). In terms of economic violence, more than half of the men respondents in the FGDs reported that the single most prevalent act of economic violence they experienced is when a woman takes control of the family's finances and excludes her partner from participating in financial decision making.

The implications of DV on men are numerous as reported by respondents in the FGDs. According to reports from the FGDs, men who experience DV in the hands of their partners manifest low social and psychological health that impact adversely on their well-being; engage in extra-marital affairs, thus rendering them susceptible to contraction of Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs) and HIV/AIDs; and making men have low self-esteem, i.e, regretting ones' existence given one's failure in marriage. The following are some excerpts from the FGDs:

Implications of DV on Men

Man, aged 46 years

I use to have a sweet social life with people around me, particularly, with my family and relatives. However, since my wife started showing me, things have changed from worse to worst. I hardly have friends or relative visiting me at home any more and this have continuously left me in perpetual misery.

Man, aged 50yrs

I have been experiencing domestic violence for the past 11 years and this has affected my health drastically. I seldom sleep well in the night because of the tension in my system especially my head. You will not believe that I have been having constant headache and this make it difficult for me to be able to organize myself. Added to this, I have even developed high blood pressure.

Man, aged 39yrs

.....experience has taught me that it is better to be unmarried than marry a woman who never allows you have peace of mind. Well as for me, I cool my nerves with a girl friend of mine before going home. She is incomparable to my wife because she cares for me and gives me attention when needed.

Woman Aged 36yrs

In many of the cases that I have abused my husband, I do observe that his reaction is not always pleasant. Through out that day, he keeps to himself or come back home very late.

Woman, Aged 43yrs

During meetings organized by my husbands' family to settle conflicts between us, my husband has consistently blamed me to be responsible for his extramarital affairs and relationships. He complains that my attitude towards him has been unaccommodating. Hence, he finds succour else where with another woman.

Men, Aged 29yrs

I no fit lie for you because I get girlfriend wey I dey go meet after I close from work. The thing wey I dey take do so na because my wife no dey gree me do for night. Now I don dey spend money to treat myself because I don catch 'scratch scratch' plenty times...[translated as: I am engaged in extramarital affairs because my wife usually turns down my sexual advances. To this effect, I have caught STIs a couple of times].

Source: from authors FGDs

Hypothesis Testing

There is no correlation between respondents' demographic characteristic and domestic violence.

Table VI. Correlation showing relation between respondents' demographic characteristics and DV.

Type of marriage	-181*
Religion	-298**
Educational Attainment	-007
Occupational Status	252**
Extra marital affairs	330**
Children's Gender	-269**

- *Significant at 0.05 level
- ** significant at 0.01 level

The correlation test was limited to the men respondents since they constitute the focus of the study. The Pearson correlation result indicates that DV is significantly related to type of marriage ($r = -0.181$ at $P < 0.05$), religion ($r = -0.298$ at $P < 0.01$), occupational status ($r = 0.252$ at $P < 0.01$), extra marital affairs ($r = 0.330$ at $P < 0.01$), and gender of the child ($r = -0.269$ at $P < 0.01$). Though, there was no significant correlation between DV and men's educational attainment ($r = -0.007$ at $P < 0.05$), the result showed a negative trend.

Interpretatively, the correlation suggests that men who are in monogamous marriages are more likely to experience DV than men in polygynous marriages. A likely reason for this is that women in monogamous marriages have no rivals to compete with hence; their position is less threatened in their homes. This differs from when the man is married to more than one woman. The wives in this regard will be concerned with pleasing the men in order to find favour before him. One of the men in the FGDs report thus: *one good way to handle women is to marry them in numbers because you would have succeeded in playing the ball into their court. All of them will be engrossed in giving you the best to remain relevant.*

Men who practice the same religion with their partners are less likely to experience DV compared to those with different religions. This is linked to the tenets and beliefs of different religions. In line with this, partners who are of the same faith are bound to view things in similar way. Another respondent complemented this result during

one of the FGDs.*Because my close friend is a Moslem and his wife is a christain, he always have misunderstanding with her because he wants his children to be worshipping in the mosque. However, his wife has been able to make the children see well in the church. All his efforts to put the children in an Arabic school proved abortive because his efforts were thwarted by his wife. This keeps hurting him to this day.*

Unemployed men are more exposed to DV from their partners than employed men. Similarly, employed men whose income are lower than that of their partners experience higher incidence of DV from their partners compared to men whose incomes are at par or higher than those of their partners. Men who engage in extra marital affairs are more likely to experience DV from their partners compared to men who are not involved in any extra-marital affair. Men who have no male children are most likely to experience DV from their partners than men who have male children. In the FGDs, some of the men respondents reported this; *my wife connives with her daughters to victimize me. If I had a son now, I am very sure he would be on my side.* Another excerpt reads: *Few months ago, I and my partner had a misunderstanding and she started abusing me. Before I new what was happening my two daughters joined her in abusing me. It did not stop there; they mutually agreed not to prepare food for me for a long time necessitating me to begin to buy food to eat outside the home.*

CONCLUSION

The increasing need to socially understand the dynamics of DV has stimulated several studies, in attempt to demystify the prevailing conceptual fog. Most study on the one hand; have treated DV as purely a gender specific problem; that is women are always the victims while men are always the perpetrators. Contrary to this general assumption, this study showed that men are equally victimized verbally, sexually, economically and physically by their partners in different; and that, marriage type, religion, occupational status, extramarital affairs, and child's gender are likely factors that predispose men to DV.

Hence, more attention be given to DV experienced by men; seminars on family issues be organized to orientate partners; parenting-skills should be improved upon to effectively socialize the child; more researches be conducted in the area of violence against men by women; socio-cultural beliefs that men cannot be abused be modified through public awareness campaigns and government should enact legislations that sanctions perpetrators alike- men and women – for DV in intimate partner relationships.

References

- Bensley, L., Macdonald, S., Van Eenwyk, J., Simmons, K.W., & Ruggles, D. (2000) *Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Injury-Washington, 1998*. Washington State Department of Health.
- Bland, R. & Orn, H. (1986) Family Violence and Psychiatric disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 31, 129-137
- Brinkerhoff, M., & Lupri, E. (1988) Interspousal Violence. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 13, 407-434
- Brown, G. (2004) Gender as a Factor in the Response of the Law-Enforcement System to Violence against Partners. *Sexuality and Culture*, 8, 1-87
- Brush, L. D. (1990) Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender and Society*, 4, 56-67
- Daly, M. & Wilson, M. (1988) *Homicide*. New York: Aldine DeGruyter
- DeKeseredy, W.S. & Schwartz, M.D. (1998) *Women Abuse on Campus: Results from the Canadian National Survey*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dobash, R., Dobash, R.E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992) The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence. *Social Problems*, 39, 71-91.
- Douglas, E.M., & Straus, M.A.(2003) *Corporal Punishment Experienced by University Students in 17 Countries and its Relation to Assault and Injury of Dating Partners*. Paper presented at the European Society of Criminology, Helsinki, Finland.
- Dutton, D.G. (1995) *The Domestic Assault of Women: Psychological and Criminal Justice Perspectives*. Vancouver: UBC Press
- Dutton, D.G., & Nicholls, T.L. (2005) The Gender Paradigm in Domestic Violence: Research and Theory. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 10, 680-714
- Ellis, D., & Stuckless, N. (1993) Hitting and Splitting: Predatory Pre-Separation Abuse among Separating Spouses. *Mediation Pilot Project Report 7*. Submitted to the Attorney General of Ontario.
- Ellis, D., & DeKeseredy, W.S. (1996) *The Wrong Stuff: An Introduction to the Sociological Study of Deviance*. (2nd edition). Toronto: Allyn & Bacon
- Fiebert, M.S., & Gonzalez, D.M. (1997) Women who Initiate Assaults: The Reasons offered for such Behaviour. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 583-590

Gaquin, D. A. (1977) Spouse Abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey. *Victimology*, No 2, 632-647

Gelles, R., & Cornel, C. (1985) *Intimate Violence in Families*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Gelles, R., & Straus, M. (1988) *Intimate Violence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gelles, R. (1993) Through a Sociological Lens: Social Structure and Family Violence: in R.J. Gelles and D. Loseke (eds), *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp. 31-46). Newbury Park, Calif: Sage.

George, M.J. (1999) A Victimization Survey of Female-Perpetrated Assaults in the United Kingdom. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 25, 67-79

Grandin, E., & Lupri, E. (1997) Intimate Violence in Canada and the United States: A Cross National Comparison. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 417-443.

Hines, D.A., & Saudino, K.J. (2003) Gender Differences in Psychological, Physical, and Sexual Aggression among College Students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims*, 18, 197-217

Jaffe, P., Lemon, N., & Poisson, S.E. (2003) *Child Custody and Domestic Violence: A Call for Safety and Accountability*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Jewkes, R. & Penn-Kekana (2001) Prevalance of Emotional, Physical and Sexual abuse of Women in 3 South African Provinces, *South African Medical Journal*, 91: 421-28

Jejeebhoy, S.J. (1998) Wife Beating in Rural Indian: A Husband's Right? Evidence from Survey Data. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33, 855-862

Kennedy, L.W., & Dutton, D. G. (1989) The Incidence of Wife Assault in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 21, 40-53

Kessler, R.C., Molner, B.E., Feurer, I.D., & Appelbaum, M. (2001) Patterns and Mental Health Predictors of Domestic Violence in the United States: Result from the National Comorbidity Survey. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 24, 487-508

Koenig, M.A., Hossan, M.B., Ahmed, S., & Haagar, J. (1999) Individual and Community-level determinants of domestic violence in Rural Bangladesh, *Working Paper Series*, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Baltimore.

Koenig, M.A., T. Lutalo, F. Zhao (2003) Domestic Violence in Rural Uganda: Evidence from a Community Based Study, *Bulletin of World Health Organisation*, 81, 53-60.

Kincaid, P.J. (1982) *The Omitted Reality: Husband-Wife Violence in Ontario and Policy Implications for Education*. Maple, Ontario: Learners.

Kurz, D. (1990) *For Richer, for Poorer: Mothers Confront Divorce*. New York: Routledge.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Vivian, D. (1994) The Correlates of Spouses' Incongruent Reports of Marital Aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9, 265-283

McLeod, M. (1984) Women Against Men. An Examination of Domestic Violence based on an Analysis of Official Data and National Victimization Data. *Justice Quarterly*, 1, 17-193.

McNeely, R. & G. Robinson-Simpson (1987) The Truth about Domestic Violence: A falsely Framed Issue. *Social Work*, 32, 485-490.

McNeely, R. & Mann, C. (1990) Domestic Violence is a Human Issue. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5, 129-132

Nicholls, T.L. & Dutton, D.G. (2001) Abuse Committed by Women against Male Intimates. *Journal of Couples Therapy*, 10, 41-57

Odimegwu, C.O. (2000) VAW Prevention Initiatives: Changing Societal Attitudes to Violence against Women. Research Report submitted to J.D. and C.T. MacArthur Foundation Fund for Leadership Development Programme, Nigeria.

Quarm, D., & Schwartz, M. (1985) Domestic Violence in Criminal Court. In C. Schweber and C. Feinman (eds), *Criminal Justice Politics and Women: The Aftermath of Legally Mandated Change* (pp. 29-46). New York:Haworth.

Saunders, D. (1988) Wife Abuse, Husband Abuse, or Mutual Combat? In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (eds), *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse* (pp. 90-113). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.

Schwartz, M.D. (1987) Gender and Injury in Spousal Assault. *Sociological Focus*, 20, 61-75.

Shupe, A., Stacey, W., & Hazelwood, R. (1987) *Violent Men, Violent Couples: The Dynamics of Domestic Violence*. Lexington, Mass,

Statistics Canada (2000) *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile*. Canadian centre for Justice Statistics: Ottawa.

Steinmetz, S. (1978) The Battered Husband Syndrome. *Victimology*, 2, 499-509.

Stets, J. (1990) Verbal and Physical Aggression in Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 52, 501-514.

Straus, M.A. (1999) The Controversy over Domestic Violence by Women. A Methodological Theoretical and Sociology of Science Analysis. In X. Arriaga & S. Oskjamp (eds), *Violence in Intimate Relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 17-44

Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J. (1992) How Violent are American Families? In M.A. Straus, & R.J. Gelles (eds) *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick, N.J, Transaction Publisher, 95-108

Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (1998) *Prevalence, Incidence and Consequences of Violence against Women: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Vissing, Y.M., Straus, M.A., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J.W. (1991) Verbal Aggression by Parents and Psychosocial Problems of Children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 15, 223-238.

Walby, S. & Allen, J. (2004) 2001 *British Crime Survey*. London: Home Office

Walker, L. (1984) *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York: Springer

Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1993) Spousal Homicide Risk and estrangement. *Violence and Victims* 8, 3-15

Yllo, K. (1993) Through a Feminist Lens: Gender, Power, and Violence. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (eds), *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp.47-62). Newbury Park, California: Sage.