*Corresponding author: **Azu A. Ibiam**,
Department of Sociology, University of
Calabar, P.M.B. 1115, Calabar, CRS,
Nigeria

E-mail: lbiamazu@yahoo.com

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Determinant of Intimate partner violence Family: Parametric Statistics of the influence of household decision-making autonomy and Family Income Status

Azu A. Ibiam^{1,*}, Asari E. Anam¹, Mary U. Ojong-Ejoh¹, Dorn Cklamz Enamhe², Joseph B. Igwe-Okomiso¹ & Tabe Ojong Ejoh³

¹Department of Sociology, University of Calabar, P.M.B. 1115, Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria

²Department of Social Work, University of Calabar, P.M.B. 1115, Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria

³Vergeer Holland BV, Woerden, Netherlands

Abstract: The study is an analysis of the relationship between household decision-making autonomy, family income status and intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria. Adopting the exchange/social control theory, the study applied the survey research design in gathering data from 383 respondents from Calabar South, using a structured interview questionnaire. Elicited data was analyzed using simple lineal regression at 0.05 alpha Level. Result revealed that household decision making autonomy and family income status has significant influence on intimate partner violence in Calabar South Local Government Area. The study thereby calls for the development of evidence-based culturally appropriate interventions that address the issue of unequal power relations between men and women.

Keywords: Economic status, substance abuse, intimate partner violence, Calabar South

1. Introduction

Intimate partner violence is an issue that is common to every society and is recognized as one of the most pervasive yet least reported crimes and human rights abuse. It covers a wide range of physical, social and psychological coercive acts against intimate romantic partners (WHO, 2005). Intimate partner violence is a global issue that occurs by the hour every day. While both men and women can be victims, the most reported cases and victims are women (Brown & William, 2013; Archibong, Akomaye, Tangban, Ojong-Ejoh & Abang, 2021). Available statistics show that one in every three or 30 per cent of women has suffered abuse from an intimate partner or non-partner or from both in their lifetime (World Health Organization, 2019). Furthermore, at least a quarter of all women that are above the age of 15 and have been in an intimate relationship has suffered from one form of abuse or the other (WHO, 2013; Unim, Omang, Ojong-Ejoh, & Abang, 2020; Archibong, Akomaye, Tangban, Ojong-Ejoh, & Abang, 2021). In Africa, the figure stands at 37 per cent of all women (WHO, 2015).

In Nigeria, the case is not different, the National Population Commission and ICF international report in 2017 estimate that women exposed to intimate violence from their intimate partner stand at 19 per cent for intimate emotional violence, 14 per cent for intimate physical violence and 5 per cent for sexual intimate violence (NPC & ICF, 2017; Benebo,

Schumann, & Vaezghasemi, 2018; Ojong-Ejoh, Cobham, Iloeje, & Tangban, 2021). Other studies in Nigeria on intimate partner violence revealed that 31 to 61 per cent suffer from sexual violence and 7 to 31 per cent from physical violence (Barebo, Schuman & vaezghasemi, 2018). These are just cases reported. Also, regional studies revealed that intimate partner violence range from 29 per cent in the Southwest, 41 per cent in the South-South and 42 per cent in the Northern part of the country and 78.8 per cent in the South East region of Nigeria (Barebo et al., 2018; Okenwa, Lawoko & Jansson, 2009; Okemgbo, Omideti & Odimegwu, 2002, Dienye, Gbeneol, Itum, 2014).

In cross river state and Nigeria as a whole, never a day goes by without shocking news of one form of intimate partner violence. If it is not news of discovered baby-making factory. In that case, it will be of a man killing his wife or a man psychically battering his wife or a father physically violating his relation by sexually abusing her. In Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria, cases of intimate violence against women are on the increase. There have been cases of husbands killing or maning their partners. According to the statistics provided by this day (2011), about 50 per cent of women were battered by their husbands in 2010 in the southeast of Nigeria alone, in which Calabar South Local Government Area is one of them. In Calabar South Local Government Area, because of the paternal nature of the society, cases of intimate partner violence are hardly reported. According to This Day (2011), a staggering 97 per cent of intimate partner violence are not reported. Only four states in Nigeria have passed bills against intimate violence (Abia State is one of them). None have really put it into practice.

Studies have attributed the prevalence of intimate partner violence in African Societies to gender inequality and power imbalance perpetuated by African societies' cultures (Ebrahim & Atteraya, 2019). Extensive studies have been carried out to examine the various gender inequality factors that influence violence among couples. But just a few have examined the role of decision making, especially in Calabar. Also, there is a dearth of studies that have extensively looked at the influence of family income. This study is set to bridge this gap by assessing a relationship between household decision making autonomy, family income status and intimate partner violence in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria.

2. Theoretical Foundation

The exchange/ social control theory was adopted for this study. Sociologists use the exchange theory to explain violence in the family. The theory argues that family violence such as intimate partner violence and domestic violence occurs when the reward outweighs the risk of committing such violence. (Gelles, 1983; Gelles & Straus, 1988). Gelles (1983) linked exchange theory and social control theory when he proposed that family violence will occur without social control that binds people to order. Three points of the combined exchange/social control theory are applied to examining causes of family violence: (1) family violence will occur when rewards outweigh costs; (2) lack of effective social controls in the family decreases costs and, therefore, makes violence more likely; and (3) family and social structures, including inequality (e.g., in gender, status, economic resources, or physical strength), privacy norms of the family, and perceptions of masculinity reduce the costs and thereby increase the rewards of using violence (Gelles, 1983).

Gelles notes that exchange theory generally holds that if there is a sustained lack of reciprocity in the trade of benefits (i.e., one person consistently derives benefits without providing benefits in return), the relationship will be broken off by the person not benefiting. However, in intimate partner violence scenarios, ending the relationship is impossible even when reciprocity is lacking due to a potential imbalance of resources. Using this theory as an underpinning for understanding intimate partner violence, it is asserted that to reduce the occurrence of violence in a family, rewards must be decreased (by ending the social glorification of violence that produces rewards), and costs must be increased (stricter legal and/or social consequences must be imposed; Gelles, 1983).

3. Research Method and Materials [11pt, Garamond, Bold, Justified]

3.1. Design and Measurement Tool

The researcher adopted a survey research design. This design will be employed to enable the researcher to investigate the associate factors influencing intimate partner violence, which is the existing phenomenon in the study (Uyilowohma, Okon & Unim, 2021; Ibiam, Bekomson, & Angioha, 2020). A structured interview questionnaire developed in a Likert Scale format was used to elicit required data from women above the ages of 15 in Calabar South. The instrument contained ten (10) items divided into two subsections according to the two measurement variables of household decision-making autonomy and income.

3.2. Population and Sampling

The population of the study are women found in the study area. According to NPC (2006), the population of women in Calabar South is 93,931. Therefore, the sample size of the study is 384. This was arrived at using the Survey Monkey Sample Size Determinant Technique. The researcher adopted the stratified and purposive sampling techniques in selecting the sample. First, Calabar was stratified into 11 strata according to the wards that make up the local government Area. The researcher then used the purposive sampling technique to select five wards from the 11 wards in the area. The wards are highlighted in table 1. From the five wards, the researcher purposively selected two streets each selected. The selected wards are also highlighted in table 1. From the selected streets, the researcher purposively selected 38 from 8 streets, 39 from one street and 41 from one.

Table 1. Showing the Selected Wards

S/N	Ward	Streets	Sample Size
1	7	Dan Archibong	38
		Chamley	38
2	9	Palm Street	39
		Atu Street	38
3	12	Ekpo Abasi	38
		New Airport Road	41
4	2	Ene Ndem	38
		Nsa Street	38
5	8	Edible-edible	38
		Eyo Ita	38
Total			383

3.3. Ethical Review and Data Collection

Written permission was obtained from the Ministry of Health, Cross River state allowing the study to take place. Oral permission was obtained from the research respondents before the questionnaire was given to them.

3.4. Method of Data Collection and Analysis

The researchers and assistants administered the study instrument. The assistants were trained using the World Health Organization Protocol for conducting research. The training was for two days. Because of the topic's sensitivity, only female research assistants were picked. Three hundred eighty-three (383) women were selected and administered the researcher instrument. Only 381 of the instruments retrieved was considered fit enough. Data collected were analyzed using parametric statistics.

3.5. Description of Variables and Hypotheses

The variable for this study is broken down into two independent and dependent variables. The independent variable in the study is that determinant and will be measured using female household decision-making autonomy and family income status level, and will be measured continuously. The dependent variable is intimate partner violence and will remain constant. The study hypotheses are stated thus;

- a. There is no significant association between female household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria.
- b. Family income status does not significantly influence intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Analysis One

There is no significant association between female household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria. The independent variable in this hypothesis is female decision-making autonomy, while the dependent variable is intimate partner violence, both variables were measured continuously, and inferential statistics involving simple linear regression was used to test the hypothesis at .05 Alpha level. The result is presented in table 2.

Table 2. Summary simple linear regression analysis: household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Sig
Regression	17150.972	2	17150.972	41.798	0.284 ^a	0.061	0.060	0.000 ^a
Residual	195267.691	379	149.401					
Total	212418.663	379						

a. Predictors variable: (Constant), HOUSEHOLD DECISION-MAKING AUTONOMY

b. Dependent Variable: INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Table 2 presents the result of data analysis on the relationship between household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence. Results revealed R-value of .284^a $R^2 = .081$, adjusted $R^2 = .060$, $p = .000^a$ and $< .05$ for relationship between household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence. The R-value (Correlation coefficient) is a standardized measure of an observed degree of relationship between variables, it is a commonly used measure of the size of an effect, and values of $\pm .1$ represent a small effect, $\pm .3$ is a medium effect, and $\pm .5$ is a large effect.

The R^2 -value of .061 implies that 6.1% of total variance is accounted for by predictor variable (decision-making autonomy). The regression ANOVA revealed that the $F(2, 107) 41.798$; $p < .000$, is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies a significant relationship (association) between the predictor variable (decision-making autonomy) and intimate partner violence. The adjusted R^2 (.060) shows some shrinkage of the unadjusted R-value (.061), indicating that the model could be generalized to the population. Based on the results, it was concluded that; household decision-making autonomy significantly influences intimate partner violence.

4.2. Analysis two

Family income status does not significantly influence intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State, Nigeria. The independent variable in this hypothesis is Family income, while the dependent variable is intimate partner violence. Both variables were measured continuously, and inferential statistics involving simple linear regression was used to test the hypothesis at .05 Alpha level. The result is presented in table 3.

Table 3 presents the result of data analysis on the relationship between Family income status and intimate partner violence. Results revealed R-value of .245^a $R^2 = .057$, adjusted $R^2 = .055$, $p = .000^a$ and $< .05$ for relationship between Family income status and intimate partner violence. The R-value (Correlation coefficient) is a standardized measure of an observed degree of relationship between variables, it is a commonly used measure of the size of an effect, and values of $\pm .1$ represent a small effect, $\pm .3$ is a medium effect, and $\pm .5$ is a large effect.

Table 3. Summary simple linear regression analysis between Family income status and intimate partner violence

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Sig
Regression	12733.559	2	12733.559	33.345	0.245 ^a	0.057	0.055	0.000 ^a
Residual	199685.104	379	152.781					
Total	212418.663	379						

a. Predictors variable: (Constant), FAMILY INCOME

b. Dependent Variable: INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

The R^2 –value of .057 implies that the predictor variable accounts for 5.7% of the total variance (Family income). The regression ANOVA revealed that the $F(2, 107) 33.345$; $p < .000$, is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies a significant relationship (association) between the predictor variable (Family income) and intimate partner violence. The adjusted R^2 (.055) shows some shrinkage of the unadjusted R -value (.057), indicating that the model could be generalized to the population. Based on the results, it was concluded that; family income status significantly influences intimate partner violence

4.3. Discussion

The first analysis revealed that household decision making autonomy significantly influences intimate partner violence. The analysis using lineal regression revealed R -value of .284a $R^2 = .081$, adjusted $R^2 = .060$, $p = .000a$ and $< .05$ for relationship between household decision-making autonomy and intimate partner violence. The regression ANOVA revealed that the $F(2, 107) 41.798$; $p < .000$, is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies a significant relationship (association) between the predictor variable (decision-making autonomy) and intimate partner violence. The R^2 –value of .061 implies that 6.1% of total variance is accounted for by predictor variable (decision-making autonomy). With this result, we can conclude that household decision making autonomy significantly influences intimate partner violence in the study area.

This is similar to the study of Mavisakalyan and Rammohan (2020), who found that an increase in female autonomy in decision-making autonomy significantly influences intimate partner violence. Zegenhagen, Ranganathan, and Buller (2019) argued that decision making autonomy determines intimate partner violence.

The second analysis revealed that family income status significantly influences intimate partner violence. The analysis using lineal regression revealed R -value of .245a $R^2 = .057$, adjusted $R^2 = .055$, $p = .000a$ and $< .05$ for relationship between Family income status and intimate partner violence. The regression ANOVA revealed that the $F(2, 107) 33.345$; $p < .000$, is significant. Therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. This implies a significant relationship (association) between the predictor variable (Family income) and intimate partner violence. Also, the R^2 –value of .057 implies that 5.7% of total variance in intimate partner violence is accounted for by predictor variable (Family income). This result shows that family income status significantly influences intimate partner violence in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State.

The findings of Ahmadabadi, Najman, Williams, and Clavarino (2017) in their study on income, gender and forms of intimate partner violence found that men and women experience a higher number of intimate partner violence when the husband earns lower income. Abramsky, Lees, Stöckl, Harvey, Kapiga, Ranganathan, Mshana, and Kapiga (2019) found that women income is seen as protection against intimate partner violence, but women who contribute more financially are at greater risk of intimate partner violence

5. Conclusion

The study concludes that household decision making autonomy and family income status significantly determine the rate of intimate partner violence in Calabar South, Cross River State. Based on this finding, The study recommends a need for the development of evidence-

based culturally appropriate interventions that address the issue of unequal power relations between men and women that make women vulnerable to intimate partner violence. Also, there is a need to put in place appropriate education materials for improving the communication skills of women and intimate couples

References

- Abramsky, T., Lees, S., Stöckl, H., Harvey, S., Kapinga, I., Ranganathan, M., Mshana, G., & Kapiga, S. (2019). Women's income and risk of intimate partner violence: secondary findings from the MAISHA cluster-randomized trial in North-Western Tanzania. *BMC Public Health*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7454-1>
- Anzaku, S. A., Shuaibu, A., Dankyau, M. & Chima, G. A. (2017). Intimate partner violence and associated factors in an obstetric population in Jos, North-central Nigeria. *Sabel Med J*;20:49-54
- Archibong, E. P., Akomaye, S., Tangban, E., Ojong-Ejoh, M., & Abang, T. A. (2021). Using descriptive analysis to assess the psychosis mental health effect of intimate partner violence in Obudu, Cross River State, Nigeria. *ARRUS journal of social sciences and humanities*, 1(1), 32-43.
- Benebo, O. F., Schumann, B. & Vaezghasemi, M. (2018). Intimate partner violence against women in Nigeria: a multilevel study investigating the effect of women's status and community norms. *BMC Women's Health* <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-018-0628-7>
- Bonnes, S. (2016). Education and Income Imbalances Among Married Couples in Malawi as Predictors for Likelihood of Physical and Emotional Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 31(1), 51–70. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.vv-d-14-00016>
- Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2), 231–280.
- Ebrahim, N. B., & Atteraya, M. S. (2019). Women's Household Decision-Making and Intimate Partner Violence in Ethiopia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 8(2), 285–292. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ajis-2019-0041>
- Gelles, R. J. (1983). An exchange/social control theory. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.) *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 151–165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster
- Ibiam, A. A., Bekomson, E. M., & Angioha, P. U. (2020). Socio-Environmental Factors as Determinants of Social Wellbeing of Adolescents in Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria. *European Journal of Public Health Studies*, 1(2).
- Isangedighi, J. A., Joshua, M. T., Asim, A. E. & Ekuri, E. E. (2004). *Fundamentals of research and statistics in education and social sciences*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- Mavisakalyan, A., & Rammohan, A. (2020). Female autonomy in household decision-making and intimate partner violence: evidence from Pakistan. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 19(1), 255–280. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11150-020-09525-8>
- National Population Commission (NPC) and ICF International. (2014). National demographic and health survey 2013. Abuja: National Population Commission.
- Ogum, A. D., Addo-Lartey, A. A., Sikweyiya, Y., Chirwa, E. D., Coker-Appiah, D. & Jewkes R. (2018) Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence among women in four districts

of the central region of Ghana: Baseline findings from a cluster randomized controlled trial. *PLoS ONE* 13(7): e0200874.

- Ojong-Ejoh, M. U., Cobham, G., Iloeje, I. A., & Tangban, E. E. (2021). Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis of Traditional Practices and Gender-Based Violence . *ARRUS Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 23-31. <https://doi.org/10.35877/soshum485>
- Okemgbo, C. N., Omideyi, A. K. & Odimegwu, C. O. (2002). Prevalence, patterns and correlates of domestic violence in selected Igbo communities of Imo State, Nigeria. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 6:101–14.
- Okenwa, L. E., Lawoko, S., & Jansson, B. (2009). Exposure to intimate partner violence amongst women of reproductive age in Lagos, Nigeria: Prevalence and predictors. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 517-530.
- Onigbogi, M. O., Odeyemi, K. A., Onigbogi, O. O. (2015). Prevalence and Factors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence among Married Women in an Urban Community in Lagos State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*. 19(1):91-100
- Unim, A. P., Omang, T. A., Ojong-Ejoh, M. U., & Abang, T. (2020). Covid-19 Measures and the Exacerbation of Intimate Partner Violence in Calabar. *IJO-International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 3(12), 83-97.
- Uyilowohma, O. E. M., Okon, B. A., & Unim, A. P. (2021). Uplifting the Socioeconomic Life of Rural People through the Provision of Credit facilities and Entrepreneurship Development: The Role of CUSO International. *FWU Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(1).
- World Health Organization. (2013). Global and regional estimates of violence against women prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence [Internet]. World Health Organization. Italy: World. Ahmadabadi, Z., Najman, J. M., Williams, G. M., & Clavarino, A. M. (2017). Income, Gender, and Forms of Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(23–24), 5500–5525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517719541>
- Zegenhagen, S., Ranganathan, M., & Buller, A. M. (2019). Household decision-making and its association with intimate partner violence: Examining differences in men's and women's perceptions in Uganda. *JSM - Population Health*, 8, 100442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2019.100442>