



Influence of Socio Demography Factors on Knowledge of Intimate Partner Violence among Soldiers in Ibadan: A Cross Sectional Survey

O. T. Kazeem

Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan

S. T. Olasupo

Nigerian Army Medical Corps, Headquarters, Lagos

N. A. A. Hussain

Nigerian Army Medical Corps, Headquarters, Lagos

T. M. Akande

Department of Epidemiology and Community Health,
University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital

A. G. Salaudeen

Department of Epidemiology and Community Health,
University of Ilorin Teaching Hospital

ABSTRACT

The global dimensions of intimate partner violence are alarming. It occurs in all parts of society, regardless of geographic location, socio-economic status, age, cultural and ethnic background, or religious belief, and it's often devastating effects -psychological, social and economic, short-term and long-term — rebound on families, children, and the community as a whole. This study investigated influence of socio demography factors on knowledge of intimate partner violence among soldiers in Ibadan. Prevalence of knowledge of IPV was also examined. The non experimental study adopted cross sectional design. A total of 26- item carefully structured self report questionnaire was administered to three hundred and fifty-five (N=355) purposively selected married soldiers from Adekunle Fajuyi cantonment, Ibadan, out of which 294 (82.8%) were male and 61 (17.2%) were female. All the respondents (100%) completed at least secondary school education. It was found that prevalence of knowledge of IPV was 192(54.5%). Age of the participants was more on knowledge of IPV than Spouse's age, years in marriage and educational qualification. Soldiers' rank did not have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV) ($F(16, 339)=.584; P>.05$). Male are more on knowledge of IPV than female ($t(353)=3.21; P<.05$). Type of marriage did not have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence ($F(4, 350)=1.384; P>.05$). There is need for proactive action on sensitization on intimate partner violence in the Nigerian military.

Index term: knowledge of intimate partner violence, Soldiers, Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment,

BACKGROUND

Gender based violence (GBV) is defined as any act of violence that results in, or is likely to result in, physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering to women, including threats of such acts, coercion or arbitrary deprivation of liberty, whether occurring in public or in private life.¹It is

the most common form of violence experienced by women around the world.¹ Despite one in six women being a victim of this violence, the challenge remains largely hidden for obvious reasons. Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a form of gender based violence and according to the World Health Report on Violence and Health, IPV refers to any behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, psychological or sexual harm to those in the relationship male and female alike.² This definition has been modified to any behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviours.³ This was to include all previous definitions of spousal violence.

IPV can take a variety of forms including physical assault such as hits, slaps, kicks, and beatings; psychological abuse, such as constant belittling, intimidation, humiliation and coercive sex. It frequently includes controlling behaviours such as isolating a woman from family and friends, monitoring her movements (stalking) and restricting her access to resources.^{2,4} Although both men and women assume either role of victim or perpetrator, females are usually the victims in male-dominated patriarchal societies with less gender equality like Nigeria, while higher levels of male IPV victimization occur in countries with greater gender equality.⁵ Population-based studies from several countries indicate that between 10% and 75% of women reported that an intimate partner had physically abused them at least once in their lifetime.⁵ The lowest figure of 10% was reported in Paraguay and Philippines while the highest prevalence rates were recorded in Bangladesh.^{2,4,6,7,8} Similarly, lifetime prevalence of physical or sexual partner violence or both varied from 15% to 71% in a study of 15 sites in 10 different countries.⁶ Overall, at least 1 in 3 of the world's female population has been physically or sexually violated by a man or men at some time in their lives.⁴ It has been reported that physical violence is often associated with psychological or emotional, and sexual violence.⁹

Various risk factors for IPV have been extensively reported in the literature and in broad terms, can be classified as individual, partner, couple and societal characteristics.⁸ At the level of the individual whether victim or perpetrator, it has been reported that young women and those below the poverty line are disproportionately affected.^{9,10,11} Low socioeconomic status has also been identified as a risk factor for IPV.¹² Women who contribute a greater proportion to the family income have been identified to be at risk, possibly because the woman's economic power questions the man's role as provider.^{13,14,15}

In Nigeria, Fawole and colleagues who studied both male and female civil servants in Ibadan, found that being young, unmarried and having a history of parental violence in the partner were significantly associated with a woman being a victim of IPV.¹⁴ On the part of the perpetrator, men who abused alcohol and other psychoactive substances were more likely than those who did not abuse alcohol to perpetrate IPV.^{16,17} Witnessing parental violence or being a victim of physical violence as a child has also been associated with men who perpetrate IPV.^{14,18,19} Women who were exposed to childhood violence and witnessed domestic violence are at higher risk of being victims.^{20,11}

At the level of the couple, dysfunctional, unhealthy relationships characterized by inequality, power imbalance and conflict can lead to IPV.²⁰ IPV has repeatedly been reported to be associated with gender inequality as well as social norms supportive of traditional gender roles, and patriarchal male dominance. Similarly, the lack of institutional support from police and judicial systems and weak community sanctions are other factors known to encourage IPV.¹¹

Numerous women and girls in Nigeria are subjected to violence by some members of their families and within their communities, as in many countries throughout the world. Women of all ages across all socioeconomic groups, living in rural and urban communities are affected. The near to non-existence of official statistics particularly among the military makes accessing the enormity of the violence difficult but studies suggest that the level of violence is shockingly high in the general population. More than a third and in some groups nearly two thirds of women in Nigeria are believed to have experienced physical, sexual or psychological violence in the family.^{12,13,27} The prevalence of IPV in the Southern part of Nigeria is high ranging from 31.3% to 78.8%.^{14,15,28} The situation is not too different in the Northern part of the country with prevalence ranging from 36% to 77.2%.^{18,21,29,30} Odujinrin found wife battering to be highly prevalent with 81% of women interviewed in Lagos reporting having been beaten by their husbands.³¹ Another study conducted by Federal Ministry of Health (FMOH) and World Health Organization (WHO) reveal a high prevalence of wife battery in Western Nigeria.³² There is dearth of literature on IPV among military personnel in Nigeria.

The goal of the study is to investigate influence of socio demography factors on knowledge of Intimate Partner Violence among soldiers in Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to:

- i. Discover if ranks will have any relationship with knowledge of IPV among Soldiers and
- ii. Examine if there will be mean differences of age, spouse's age, years in marriage and education on knowledge of IPV.
- iii. Ascertain influence of marriage type on knowledge of IPV.
- iv. Determine difference of gender on knowledge of IPV.

Hypotheses

H₁ = Soldiers' rank will have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV).

H₁ = There will be a significant difference between male and female on knowledge of IPV.

H₁ = Type of marriage will have significant influence on knowledge of IPV.

METHOD

The study adopted cross sectional design. The independent variables were gender, marriage type, age, rank, religion, educational qualification and spouse's education. The dependent variable was knowledge of Intimate Partner Violence. This design was also used in a similar study conducted by Kumar (2005)³³.

The study was conducted at Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment, Ibadan. The Barracks is located in Odogbo area of Ibadan in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State. The barracks was known as Odogbo Barracks but was later renamed after late Brigadier General Adekunle Fajuyi who was a military governor of then Western State of Nigeria. The Barracks is the location of the headquarters of 2 Division Nigerian Army. It has other units which are co-located in the barracks. These units are 2 Division Garrison, 52 Division Signals, 2 Division Ordnance Services, 2 Division Supply and Transport and 2 Division Medical Services. Soldiers in the Barracks participated. They were required to fill inclusion-exclusion criteria including:

- i. Being currently serving soldier of the Nigerian Army
- ii. Being married or cohabited and currently living with spouse
- iii. English literate and
- iv. Personally willing to participate after an informed consent process

A total 1778 soldiers were on the nominal roll in the barracks. Only 360 soldiers fulfilled inclusion exclusion criteria, were purposively included as participants. Out of these, 355

questionnaires were correctly filled and returned, representing 98.6% response rate. These were made up 294 (82.8%) male and 61 (17.2%).

Instruments

Data was collected with the use of a 26-item self-report questionnaire made up of two sections. The 11 items Section A was designed to tap information about respondents' socio-demographic characteristics. Such information included: gender, age, marital status, religion, year of marriage, duration of courtship, educational background, type of marriage, spouse age, spouse highest educational qualification and number of children. Section B had 15 items. It contained knowledge of intimate partner violence developed by the authors. It had a Cronbach alpha of .85.

Data Collection

The researchers obtained permission from the Department of Epidemiology and Community Health, University of Ilorin to conduct the study. Being a vulnerable group, the researcher thereafter sent the protocol for further institutional review and ethical approval from the Ministry of Defence Research Ethics Committee, which was granted following due ethical review process. The researchers also discussed the protocol with the Authority of Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment, Ibadan.

At the barrack, the nominal records of the participants were reviewed to identify potential participants that meet the inclusion-exclusion criteria. While the participants were not on duty, the researcher discussed the purpose of the study and gave the questionnaires to prospective participants, including a detailed informed consent document. Only willing and consenting married Soldiers were recruited as research participants. They were allowed to read the questionnaire and respond accordingly. This took an average of 40 minutes. A total of 360 of them fulfilled the inclusion criteria in the Barrack, and were purposively included as participants. Of these, only 355 questionnaires were correctly and completely filled. Completed questionnaires were sorted, coded, and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences for data analysis.

RESULTS

Table 1: Source of First Information about Intimate Partner Violence among Respondents in Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment

Source of Information about IPV	Frequency (%)
Radio	88(24.7)
Television	60(16.9)
Newspaper	56 (15.7)
Friends	43 (12.1)
Seminar	41 (11.5)
Others	67(18.8)
Total	355

The most commonest source of information about IPV was radio (24.7%), followed by television (16.9%) but preceded by others (18.8%). The least source of information was seminar (11.5%).

**Table 2: Knowledge of different forms of Intimate Partners Violence among Respondents
Adekunle Fajuyi, Ibadan.**

Knowledge	Yes (%)	No (%)
<u>Physical Violence</u>		
Beating, Kicking, Pushing	225 (63.9)	127 (36.1)
Slap	235 (66.2)	117 (33.8)
Push or shove	233 (67.0)	119 (33.0)
Choke or burn on purpose	223(62.9)	129(37.1)
<u>Psychological Violence</u>		
Insulting, Public Humiliation	230 (65.3)	122 (34.7)
Denial of resources	215 (61.1)	137 (38.9)
Denial of Freedom	212 (60.3)	140 (39.8)
Denial of Job, career or education	208 (59.4)	142 (40.6)
Threaten with a gun or other weapon	225 (63.9)	125 (35.5)
Intimidate or scare by shouting	229 (65.1)	119 (34.9)
<u>Sexual Violence</u>		
Denial of Sex	209 (59.4)	143 (40.6)
Forced to have sexual Intercourse	219(62.9)	133(37.4)

Generally, respondents have good knowledge of IPV as the percentage of YES is higher than NO as shown in table 2.

Table 3: Distribution of Soldiers' Aggregate Scores on Knowledge of Intimate Partners Violence among Soldiers in Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment

Composite Score	Frequency (%)
Good	192(54.5)
Poor	160(45.5)

Prevalence of knowledge of IPV was 192(54.5%).

Table 4: Summary of mean difference of age, spouse's age, years in marriage and education on knowledge of IPV.

	Mean	±SD	P
Age	40	5.9	
Spouse's age	34	4.6	0.001
Years in marriage	12	2.1	
Educational qualification	3	0.97	

Table 4 revealed that age of the participants was more on knowledge of IPV than Spouse's age, years in marriage and educational qualification. This implies that age had influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence.

Table 5: Summary of one way ANOVA showing influence of Soldiers' rank on knowledge of IPV

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean squares	F	Sig
Between groups	14.413	16	.901	.584	.896
Within groups	516.81	339	1.543		
Total	531.224	354			

Table 5 revealed that hypothesis which state that Soldiers' rank will have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV) was not confirmed ($F(16, 339) = .584; P > .05$). This means that rank did not have influence on knowledge of IPV.

Table 6: Summary of t-test of independent showing mean difference between male and female on Knowledge of IPV

Gender	N	Mean	SD	df	t	P
Male	294	112	10.1	350	3.21	<.05
Female		58.23	4.5			

Table 6 showed hypothesis which state that there will be a significant difference between male and female on knowledge of IPV was supported ($t(353) = 3.21; P < .05$). This implies that male ($x=112$) soldiers were more knowledge on IPV than female ($x=23$).

Table 7: Summary of one way ANOVA showing influence of marriage type on knowledge of IPV

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean squares	F	Sig
Between groups	20.613	4	.401	1.384	.506
Within groups	516.81	350	1.243		
Total	536.694	354			

Table 7 revealed that hypothesis which state that type of marriage will have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV) was not confirmed ($F(4, 350)=1.384; P>.05$).

DISCUSSION

The investigated influence of age, sex, type of marriage, and rank on knowledge of intimate partner violence among soldiers in Adekunle Fajuyi Cantonment, Ibadan. It was found that Soldiers' rank did not have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV), male are more on knowledge of IPV than female and type of marriage did not have significant influence on knowledge of intimate partner violence (IPV).

In contrast with the study conducted in Abuja among pregnant women, almost all the women (92.9%) in the study were aware of domestic violence²⁸ Fawole and colleagues reported in another study on intimate partner violence that all the civil servants respondents (431, 100%) in a study in Ibadan were aware of intimate partner violence and could give examples of acts that constitute this form of violence.¹³ In a similar study in South West Nigeria, it was reported that awareness and knowledge of various acts that constituted violence against women was high the respondents.

In similar studies in developing countries, significant proportions of both men and women justify IPV to punish a woman's transgression from her normative roles in society.^{11,14,17} Disobedience, adultery, and disrespect of her husband's relatives were also seen as justifiable reasons for IPV.^{12,34,35,36} Moreover, many of women appear to reinforce IPV, as they more often than men justify such abuse and tend to oppose punishment for IPV-related aggression.¹² The reasons why potential victims of IPV (i.e., women) justify it remain elusive, but factors such as their disempowered position may offer a plausible explanation. Attitudes toward intimate partner violence were compared between Zambian and Kenyan men on socio-demographic, attitudinal, and structural predictors of such attitudes. The results showed that almost three quarters of the men in Zambia (71%) and well over halve in Kenya (68%) justified IPV to punish a woman for transgression from normative domestic roles.³⁸ Access to information (i.e., newspapers and radio) was independently associated with a lower likelihood of justifying IPV among Zambian men.

Intimate partner violence has seldom been measured in the military, although the issue is recognised as serious. Globally, only few militaries like the United States military have made attempts to document the prevalence rates of IPV among its military. In the available literature, prevalence rates of IPV perpetration among active duty servicemen and veterans vary widely, with rates ranging from 13.5% to 58% in the United States.³⁹ The official reports of spousal abuse in the U.S Army indicate a past-year prevalence in 1996 between 8.0% and 10.5% of married couples, whereas the Heyman and Neidig (1999) survey of married army couples found 22.8% of the active duty males and 31.1% of the active duty females reported

perpetrating physical violence against a wife or husband in the prior year.⁴⁰ Heyman and Neidig also reported that 13.3% of the men and 17.5% of the women reported past year moderate (i.e., threw something that could hurt; pushed, grabbed, or shoved; slapped; kicked, bit, or hit with a fist) to severe (beat up; choked; threatened with a knife or gun; used a knife or gun) husband violence.⁴¹ In a representative sample of Caucasian men enlisted in the U.S. Army, 30% reported perpetrating IPV during the past year. Similarly, a rate of 32% was found in a representative sample of active duty, primarily enlisted, Army servicemen.⁴² In another study of 616 active duty military women in the U.S. Army, Campbell et al reported 30% adult lifetime IPV, defined as physical and/or sexual assault. The lifetime prevalence of any abuse, including emotional abuse and/or stalking, was 44.3%.⁴³

CONCLUSION

One of the major contributions of the study to gender based violence study is the mean combination of age, spouse's age, year in marriage and education. For instance, it was discovered that age of the participants was more likely to influence knowledge of IPV than years in marriage and educational qualification. This implies that age is critical in understanding intimate partner violence. Male are more on knowledge of IPV than female in the study. This might result from male dominant population in the Nigerian Army. The prevalence of knowledge of IPV is alarming but effort has to be intensified to sensitize military personnel on implication of IPV on positive living.

References

- United Nations. A/RES/48/104. Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women [Internet]. [cited 2014 Jul 14]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/48/a48r104.htm>
- Campbell JC. Health Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence. *The Lancet*. 2002 Apr;359(9314):1331–6.
- World Health Organisation/London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. Preventing Intimate and Sexual Violence against Women: Taking Action and Generating Evidence. World Health Organization; 2010.
- Krug EG, World Health Organization. World Report on Violence and Health [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2002 [cited 2014 Jul 14]. Available from: <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10018409>
- Heise L, Ellsberg M, Gottmoeller M. Ending Violence Against Women. Baltimore: John Hopkins University School of Public Health; 1999. Report No.: 11.
- Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HAFM, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts CH, WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women Study Team. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *Lancet*. 2006 Oct 7;368(9543):1260–9.
- Silverman JG, Gupta J, Decker MR, Kapur N, Raj A. Intimate partner violence and unwanted pregnancy, miscarriage, induced abortion, and stillbirth among a national sample of Bangladeshi women. *BJOG Int J ObstetGynaecol*. 2007 Oct;114(10):1246–52.
- Heise L, Ellsberg M, Gottmoeller M. A global overview of gender-based violence. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 2002 Sep;78:S5–14.
- Ellsberg M, Peña R, Herrera A, Liljestrang J, Winkvist A. Candies in Hell: Women's Experiences of Violence in Nicaragua. *SocSci Med* 1982. 2000 Dec;51(11):1595–610.
- Martin SL, Kilgallen B, Tsui AO, Maitra K, Singh KK, Kupper LL. Sexual Behaviors and Reproductive Health Outcomes: Associations with Wife Abuse in India. *JAMA J Am Med Assoc*. 1999 Nov 24;282(20):1967–72.
- Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence|ViolencePrevention|InjuryCenter|CDC [Internet]. [cited 2014 Jul 15]. Available from: <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/consequences.html>
- Koenig MA, Lutalo T, Zhao F, Nalugoda F, Wabwire-Mangen F, Kiwanuka N, et al. Domestic Violence in Rural Uganda: Evidence from a Community-Based Study. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2003 Jan;81(1):53–60.
- Perilla JL, Bakeman R, Norris FH. Culture and Domestic Violence: the Ecology of Abused Latinas. *Violence Vict*. 1994;9(4):325–39.

- Fawole O, Aderonmu A, Fawole A. Intimate Partner Abuse: Wife Beating among Civil Servants in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2005;9(2):54–64.
- Ilika AL, Okonkwo PI, Adogu P. Intimate Partner Violence among Women of Childbearing Age in a Primary Health Care Centre in Nigeria. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2002 Dec;6(3):53–8.
- Klevens J, Shelley G, Clavel-Arcas C, Barney DD, Tobar C, Duran ES, et al. Latinos' Perspectives and Experiences with Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Women*. 2007 Feb;13(2):141–58.
- Chimah UC, Adogu POU, Ubajaka CF, Ilika AL, Egenti NB. Attitude and Perception of Intimate Partner Violence among Women in Military and Civilian Communities in Abuja Nigeria. *AdvApplSociol*. 2015;05(06):195–205.
- Ameh N, Abdul MA. Prevalence of domestic violence amongst pregnant women in Zaria, Nigeria. *Ann Afr Med [Internet]*. 2004 Aug 10 [cited 2014 Jul 15];3(1). Available from: <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/aam/article/view/8291>
- Stickley A, Timofeeva I, Sparen P. Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in St. Petersburg, Russia [Internet]. [cited 2014 Jul 15]. Available from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/publications/abstract.aspx?ID=244421>
- Gupta J, Silverman JG, Hemenway D, Acevedo-Garcia D, Stein DJ, Williams DR. Physical Violence against Intimate Partners and Related Exposures to Violence among South African Men. *Can Med Assoc J*. 2008 Sep 9;179(6):535–41.
- Ameh N, Kene TS, Onuh SO, Okohue JE, Umeora OJU, Umeora DUJ, et al. Burden of Domestic Violence amongst Infertile Women Attending Infertility Clinics in Nigeria. *Niger J Med J Natl Assoc Resid Dr Niger*. 2007 Dec;16(4):375–7.
- Abrahams N, Jewkes R, Laubscher R, Hoffman M. Intimate Partner Violence: Prevalence and Risk Factors for Men in Cape Town, South Africa. *Violence Vict*. 2006 Apr 1;21(2):247–64.
- [Article] Nigeria's unheard voices: widespread violence against women in the family [Internet]. Village Square Forum. [cited 2014 Jul 15]. Available from: <http://nigeriavillagesquare.com/forum/showthread.php?t=9399>
- Clark CJ, Silverman JG, Shahrouri M, Everson-Rose S, Groce N. The Role of the Extended Family in Women's Risk of Intimate Partner Violence in Jordan. *SocSci Med* 1982. 2010 Jan;70(1):144–51.
- Watts C, Keogh E, Ndlovu M, Kwaramba R. Withholding of Sex and Forced Sex: Dimensions of Violence Against Zimbabwean Women. *Reprod Health Matters*. 1998 Nov;6(12):57–65.
- Coker A, Richter DL. Violence against Women in Sierra Leone: Frequency and Correlates of Intimate Partner Violence and Forced Sexual Intercourse. *CRVAW Fac J Artic [Internet]*. 1998 Jan 1; Available from: http://uknowledge.uky.edu/crvaw_facpub/145
- Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence against Women: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey. *Research in Brief*. 1998 Nov [cited 2014 Jul 15]; Available from: <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED434980>
- Okemgbo C, Omideyi A, Odimegwu C. Prevalence, Patterns and Correlates of Domestic Violence in Selected Igbo Communities of Imo State, Nigeria. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2002;6(2):101–14.
- Andeyaba A. An Epidemiological Study of Wife Battery in Jos. [Lagos]: National Postgraduate Medical College of Nigeria; 2000.
- Efetié ER, Salami HA. Domestic Violence on Pregnant Women in Abuja, Nigeria. *J ObstetGynaecol J Inst ObstetGynaecol*. 2007 May;27(4):379–82.
- Odujinrin O. Wife Battering in Nigeria. *Int J Gynecol Obstet*. 1993 May;41(2):159–64.
- Wathen CN, MacMillan HL. Prevention of Violence against Women: Recommendation Statement from the Canadian Task Force on Preventive H
- Kumar S, Jeyaseelan L, Suresh S, Ahuja RC. Domestic Violence and its Mental Health Correlates in Indian Women. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2005 Jul 1;187(1):62–7.
- Hajjar L. Religion, State Power, and Domestic Violence in Muslim Societies: A Framework for Comparative Analysis. *Law Soc Inq*. 2004;29(1):1–38.
- Kort A. Dar al-Cyber Islam: Women, domestic violence, and the Islamic Reformation on the World Wide Web. *J Muslim Minor Aff*. 2005 Dec 1;25(3):363–83.

Haj-Yahia MM. Beliefs About Wife Beating among Arab Men from Israel: The Influence of their Patriarchal Ideology. *J Fam Violence*. 2003;18(4):193–206.

Klein D. The Dark Side of Marriage: Battered Wives and the Domination of Women. *Judge Lawyer Vict Thief Women GendRolesCrim Justice*. 1982;88–107.

National Population Commission (NPC) [Nigeria] and ICF International. *Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2013*. Abuja, Nigeria and Rockville Maryland USA; 2014 p. 279–315.

Duffy L. Suffering, Shame, and Silence: The Stigma of HIV/AIDS. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2005 Jan 1;16(1):13–20.

Owoaje E, OlaOlorun F. Women at Risk of Physical Intimate Violence: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of a Low-Income Community in South West Nigeria. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2012 Mar;16(1):43–53.

Owoaje E, OlaOlorun F. Intimate Partner Violence among Women in a Migrant Community in Southwest Nigeria. *Int Q Community Health Educ*. 2006;25(4):337–49.

Lawoko S. Predictors of Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence: A Comparative Study of Men in Zambia and Kenya. *J Interpers Violence*. 2008 Feb 22;23(8):1056–74.

Spindel C, Levy E, Connor M. With An End in Sight. Strategies From the UNIFEM Trust Fund to Eliminate Violence Against Women. 2000 [cited 2014 Aug 6]; Available from: <http://www.popline.org/node/239307>