



THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS (EDUCATIONAL AND INCOME LEVEL) ON MALE DOMESTIC ABUSE AMONG MARRIED MEN IN AWKA

Micheal O. Ezenwa (Prof.), Nnaemeka I. Josephine, Cynthia N.C. Udeze

Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra state Nigeria. E-mail: mo.ezenwa@unizik.edu.ng
Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra state Nigeria. E-mail: ifeomannaemeka@gmail.com
Department of Psychology, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra state Nigeria. E-mail: cn.onyejiaka_udeze@unizik.edu.ng

Abstract

The study explored the influence of socio-economic status (educational level and income level dimension) on male domestic abuse among married men in Awka. The participants of the study comprised 297 married men drawn from a population of civil servants (119), business men (94) and artisans (83) living within Awka capital territory in Anambra State. The participants' ages ranged from 37 to 59 years with mean age of 43.50 years and standard deviation of 3.60. Purposive sampling was used to select the three sectors from where the participants were drawn whereas simple random sampling was adopted to select the individual participants. After extensive review of literature, the conceptual model was anchored on Goode's (1971) Resource theory and three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2- 39) developed by Straus (1979) was used for data collection. Being a cross sectional survey study, factorial design and 2-way analysis of variance was adopted as design and statistics for data analysis. The result discriminated mean score across the groups whose mean differences were confirmed in the between subjects effects at $F(1, 297) = 4.53, p < .05$ and $F(1, 297) = 6.59, p < .05$ respectively for educational level groups and income level groups. There was also a significant interaction effect between educational level groups and income level groups at $F(1, 297) = 3.61, p < .05$. Hence, the alternate hypotheses I, II and III were confirmed respectively. It is recommended that population with homogenous characteristics be used in future studies to confirm causative influences as elaborated.

Keywords: Domestic abuse, Education level, Income level and Socio-economic status

Introduction

Many associated factors such as socio-cultural evolution like increasing participation of women in economic activities and gender emancipation, urbanization, growing unemployment rate, job losses, influence of science and technology, general rise in the cost of living etc. have in no small measure impacted negatively on many families. The advancement of the human society with these evolutionary changes has pressured the family unison more adversely especially with more incidences of domestic violence and partner abuse. In many visible forms, the struggle with many families has seen domestic abuse skyrocketed (Ifeanyi-Obi, Agumagu, & Iromuanya, 2017; Trinh, Oh, Choi, To & Do, 2016), a situation which the World Health Organization declared as emergency (WHO, 2013).

Domestic abuse most times referred to as domestic violence or family violence is any behaviour (commission or omission) which is aimed at exacting undue control, coercion, threats, degradation towards any member of the family physically, psychologically, emotionally, and socio-economically and by so doing make them suffer pain or deprivation. Domestic abuse is a common occurrence in the human society with the patterns being more distinct with male abusers than the other way round (Bell, Dinwiddie, &

Hamby, 2018). Wife battery, verbal abuse and financial withdrawal were identified as the leading abusive behaviour among males (Esquivel-Santoveña, Lambert, Hamel, 2013). With domestic abuse still so high in our society especial with many families struggling economically; there ground to believe that the strong case for women emancipation has narrowed stakeholders' focus on other potential victims of domestic abuse such as: children, the elderly and males (WHO, 2015; Caldwell, Swan, Woodbrown, 2012; Swan, Gambone, Caldwell, Sullivan, Snow, 2008) with the later being the concern of this study.

Domestic abuse or violence is a leading public health concern throughout the world. The prevalence is high and rising and there are serious physical, mental, health as well as social consequences (WHO, 2013). Globally, about 35% of women in one form or another have reported being abused, however statistic is not known about their male counterparts with similar consequences. This cannot be ignored anymore with a growing number of victims orchestrating challenges for the wellbeing of the family and the health of the victims. Thus, many factors such as health concerns, displacement, family crises and even death of the victims have compelled a research focus in the patterns, causes and consequences of male abuse in our society.

Studies such as Esquivel-Santoveña, Lambert, Hamel's (2013) study on "partner abuse worldwide" and "gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes" by Caldwell, Swan, and Woodbrown (2012) have shown that in many significant ways male partner abuse with dire consequences is real and under reported. The situation is in practice a grave oversight to the wellbeing of the family with very defining health situations. Against this backdrop, the current study is an effort to bring to the knowledge of stakeholders the possibly endangered male partners who may have becomes victims in many salient ways.

Male domestic abuse is similar in nature to domestic partner abuse of women except that males are the victims here and forms of manifestation differ. Male domestic abuser (which could be from the wife, parents, siblings/relatives or children) is any form of behaviour (commission or omission) which is aimed at having undue control, coercion, threats, degradation towards the man in his family. The form and manner in which male domestic abuse occurs is usually discretional but most commonly targeted at discrediting the man, undermining his authority, destroying his ego or humiliating him either physically, psychologically, emotionally, and socio-economically (Lubker, 2004). Such actions or inactions are known to make the male victim also suffer pain or deprivation.

Over the years, socio-cultural factors inhibited victims of domestic male abuse from freely reporting the incident or seeking help because of the social stigma which may be associated with a man reporting that he is being abused others. Consequently, many victims have suffered in silence for the fear of being ridiculed that they are not a man. However, the trend is fast changing with more domestic male abuse being reported daily. The question that has being on the minds of stakeholders on this pattern of abuse remain the why? There could be several reasons, but, prominent among them is socio-cultural factors or other known differences between the abused and their abusers.

Although, there is large and overwhelming influence by long practice of patriarchal system (because of norms of pro-inheritance) which led to a predominantly domestic abuse of women than men; however, with rapid changes in socio-economic strata which have seen more empowerment of women through pursuit of careers and economic independency, the tides may have become even among males and females abusers. It is not difficult to see families where women are the bread winners and square equally with their male counterparts (UNICEF, 2015). Studies have considerably shown that men on the other hand have become victims of domestic abuse especially when socio-economic differences are accounted for (Chaudhuri, 2012). Corbally (2015) contended that male domestic abuse often is more of emotional and psychological abuse than the obvious physical abuse which is a pattern of physical assaults and threats used to control another person such as includes punching, hitting, choking, biting, and throwing objects at a person, kicking, pushing, using a weapon such as a gun or a knife and sexual violence. In the case of men, it takes a more of a subtle form such as disobedience, disrespect, looking down, verbal abuse, unfriendly gestures, slander, sexual denial or

emotional divorce and other misgivings and uncharitable attitude target to discredit, dishonor, threaten the man to cause him any form of pain (physical, emotional, economic or social) or make him suffer deprivation (Chaudhuri, 2012).

In Nigeria like every other African nation, the practice of patriarchal system is norm with long reaching influence on family life structure. Seemingly, the patriarchal system promotes the men folk than the women folk and as such give undue advantage to men. This is the major reason while many male victims of domestic abuse are ashamed of coming forward with their cases. The causes and consequences of domestic abuse against men is an emerging social phenomenon in the Africa setting where the man remains the lord and protectorate of women and yet may suffer in silent over abuses by his partner or spouse (Dienye & Gbeneol, 2009). The questions seem to boarder around possible socio-cultural changes which have affected the family structure and which may have also created some kind of leverage for the women folk. Evaluating such socio-cultural changes there is an understanding that the evolution of socio-economic status of both men and women in the sub Sahara Africa may well account for the changes in the family structure (in terms of more women being educated than before and increasing earning power of women) and increasing prevalence of male partner abuse (Dienye & Gbeneol, 2009). For example there have been several domestic partner violence/abuse reports to law enforcement agents in Nigeria with an indication that the trend is no gender sensitive (Vanguard Newspaper, 2016). Many authors such as Corbally (2015), Chaudhuri (2012) and Dienye and Gbeneol (2009) contended that the patterns of intimate partner violence may be changing on the account of growing socio-economic factors which has continued to play significant part in the family structure and relationship there in. For instance, Gjertson (2011) contended that there is an intersection between financial capability and domestic violence just as Oguntayo, Oyeleke, Popoola, Opayemi, & Faworaja (2018) explored and found that socio-economic factors have significant influence on domestic violence among couples in Ibadan – Nigeria. These instances in the wake of the growing public health concern constitute a conviction for the researcher to assume that socio-economic factors may as well be influencing factors on the nature and prevalence of male domestic partner abuse.

Socio-economic status (SES) is a measure of a person worth in consideration of the person's education, income, occupation and other characteristics like age, gender, marriage type, length of marriage, social class, tribe, child bearing, barrenness etc. It is a great factor to be considered in investigating satisfaction in marriage, partner abuse and understanding the triggers of violence in couple's life (Oguntayo, 2015). Sociologically, socio-economic status also refers to privilege, power, influence and control which may be attributed to a person. Critically, socio-economic status continues to emphasize the gradient or continuous variable reveals inequities in access to and distribution of different forms resources in the society. The social interaction of man in commitment relationship has consistently shown to be influenced by resource power among those in the relation notably their financial income level, education level and occupation type. The impacts of these sociological factors in one way or another tend to induce domestic abuse on the vulnerable partner. The researcher has adjudged person's education, income and occupation type (or job title) to be the leading socio-economic factors of domestic abuse among couples among the native Igbos of Anambra and Imo states. The expected sociological influences in line with the researcher's views may provide requisite understanding into the causes of male domestic abuse considering the ethnic assertion that "nma nwoke bu ego" (the beauty of a man is money). In this assertion money do not necessarily mean liquid cash but all accrued social influence which comes from a man's resources.

Education is an intransitive resource because the more a man is educated, the higher the chances of success in life tend to be because education ensures employment opportunities and good work pay which increases a man's resources. Although, there are no available empirical on whether more educated men are less abused domestically or not; this study in consideration of the prepositions of resource theory is proposing that less educated men will be more vulnerable to domestic abuse than their educated counterparts (Ackerson, Kawachi, Barbeau & Subramanian, 2008). There is no doubt that education unlocks opportunities and thus in-

creases a man's or woman's chances of success. People with education tend to be more objective and broad in their view and such increases the likelihood of being easily appreciated and respected with lesser chances of being abused unlike their less educated counterparts. Such situations may also be typical of men with more income than their counterparts with much lower income. Although, male domestic violence may occur across socioeconomic classes, income level exemplifies the underpinnings of resource theory as people within the upper income level tend to have more accepted opinions than their counterparts of lower income level. For instance, Gjertson, (2011) contended that women's economic status is linked to domestic violence in three primary ways. First, poorer women are more likely to be survivors of domestic abuse than wealthier women, both due to contextual (e.g. neighborhood) and individual (e.g. male employment instability) factors. Second, women who are economically dependent on their abusers are less able to leave and more likely to return to abusive partners. Furthermore, the degree of women's economic dependence on an abuser is associated with the severity of the abuse they suffer. Greater economic dependence is associated with more severe abuse. Third, economic abuse is in itself a form of domestic abuse since abusive partners may act in ways that harm women financially and undermine their ability to become financially independent. Examples of economic abuse include limiting women's access to funds and undermining their ability to gain employment or attend school (Weaver, Sanders, Campbell & Schnabel, 2009). Given the centrality of financial matters to domestic violence, advocates have increasingly made financial capability a component of domestic violence interventions. Importantly, as Sanders (2011) emphasizes, efforts to enhance domestic violence survivors' financial capability must always be approached with safety issues in mind. Considering these contentions, it could be hypothesized that men at lower financial income level are more likely to be abused by their partners than their counterparts at higher financial income level. The influence of being educated or not and that of financial status also may not capture the entire spectrum of causes of domestic abuse based on the socioeconomic status of the man; there is need for a consideration of the impacts of job title.

Apparently, certain job titles command respect and reverence than other and hence, make the owners more immune from domestic or other forms of abuse. Some high educated men may not necessarily have job titles that are appreciated and respected in the society than low educated men. A low educated man may attract more domestic respect and love as result his job title than a high educated man. For example, a fast food or restaurant manager with low education status may enjoy more domestic respect and love than his counter who is a secondary school teacher with high education than the fast food/restaurant manager. In these instances, there is the possibility that males with less admirable job titles may become more victims of domestic abuse than those with more admirable job titles. Considering the current alarm in the public health concerns as a result of male domestic partner abuse and violence, the male folk need not to continue suffering and dying in silence as a result of domestic abuse; a time has come for stakeholders to also appreciate the male domestic partner abuse is as dangerous as the popularly known female domestic partner abuse. Interest and focus is therefore growing in this regards especially regarding the causes and consequences of male domestic partner abuse. This study has therefore been put forward to provide evidence that socio-economic factors such as education, income level and job title do have insignificant influence on male domestic partner abuse among the target population in South East Nigeria. It is the hope of the researcher that guided by the purpose of the study, available literature on the subject matter and the need to provide answers to the problem of the study; this study will in no small measures make a valuable contribution academically and pragmatically.

Research Question

The study will answer the following research questions:

- i. What is the impact of education on male domestic abuse?
- ii. What is the impact of income level on male domestic abuse?

- iii. What is the impact of job title on male domestic abuse?
- iv. What is the interaction effect of education, income level and job title on male domestic abuse?

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study is to explore the impacts of socio-economic status components namely education, income level and job title on male domestic abuse among married men living in Anambra State of Nigeria. Specifically, the study aims at:

- i. The impact of education on male domestic abuse
- ii. The impact of income level on male domestic abuse
- iii. The impact of job title on male domestic abuse
- iv. The Interaction effects of education, income level and job title on male domestic abuse.

Significance of the study

The importance of conducting research on male domestic abuse will serve several purposes notably for the improving empirical data in the area and for aiding pragmatic counseling understand the underlying causes and possible consequences of male domestic abuse especially considering that up till now global data on male domestic victim is uncertain but yet it is a steadily growing public concern as announced by World Health Organization in 2013.

The study is also relevant as it promises to bridge the gap which currently exists in literature especially as regards empirical data on the causes of male domestic abuses in sub-Saharan Africa. The data to be obtained will help future researcher to confirm existing theories on the causes of male domestic abuse and to ascertain if those existing theories are applicable in the African perspective since the research setting is in Nigeria and Africa. Furthermore, the theories that are to be confirmed from the data obtained will help to strengthen the understanding of the causes and those will gift the counseling practice in applying the principles of the theory in recommending practical and pragmatic solutions to the problem at the same time suggesting ways to mitigate its occurrence.

The study of socio-economic status and its impact on domestic health will also help to assess how the changes in the socio-cultural factors are impacting people's lives in the family. This dimension of revelation may help in the understanding of whether the impacts are more societal prone and/or individual prone and as such offer more realistic and guided counseling for practitioners and experts in the area.

There is expectation that the study will offer insights into the importance of profiling the population to understand their value system which may be of understanding in establishing causes of domestic violence and abuse. Like the Igbos in the current study, other ethnics and races may also be affected by other underlying value and norms which impact their society and members thereof. Therefore, this study highlights the importance of establishing the peculiarities of the research population and integrating same in the components of the study for more realistic outcomes and result.

Hypotheses

Considering the causes and consequences of male domestic abuse in the public among married men living in Anambra State of Nigeria as reviewed above, the following hypotheses have been formulated to guide the study:

- i. Males with high educational qualification will significantly experience less domestic abuse than males with low educational qualification.
- ii. Males with high income level will significantly experience less domestic abuse than males with low income level.
- iii. There will be a significant interaction effect between educational qualification and income level on male domestic abuse.

Methods

Participants

The participants of the study comprised 297 married men drawn from a population of civil servants (119), business men (94) and artisans (83) living within Awka capital territory in Anambra State. The participants' ages ranged from 37 to 59 years with mean age of 43.50 years and standard deviation of 3.60. Purposive sampling was used to select the three sectors from where the participants were drawn (in order to suit the research design which required participants with different job designs) while simple random sampling technique was used to select each of the participants for the study. The researcher employed the services of NYSC member to facilitate sampling of the participants during the field work. Demographic data of the participants revealed that in terms of educational background, 4 had doctoral degree, 13 have master's degree, 57 are bachelor's degree holders, 64 are higher national diploma holders (HND), 28 had NCE certification, 46 are ordinary level certificate holders (O' level), 69 have only First School Leaving Certificate while 16 participants did not indicate their level of education. In terms of religious affiliation, 271 are Christians whereas 12 indicated that they are African Religious Worshipers, 14 participants did not disclose the religious affiliation. As regards marriage experience (in terms of duration), 19 have been married for above 20yrs, 64 have been married for 16-20yrs, 122 have been married for 11-15yrs, 53 have been married for 5-10yrs, and 39 have been married for 0-4 yrs. In terms of income level, using Median per capita income of Nigeria at \$493 (N177,480) Gallup Metrics (2013), 174 indicated that they are low income earners (less than N177,480/1yr), while 123 are high income earner (above N177,480/1yr). In terms of job title, civil servant are 92, artisans are 103 CEO/Biz men were 104.

Instruments

The instrument for data collection was Conflict tactics scale (dependent variable) abridged version by Straus (1979) which will be used to measure male domestic abuse while socio-economic status (independent variable) broken into socio-economic factors namely: education level, income level and job title will be measured with the aid of elicited demographic data from the participants.

Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979)

In this study the dependent variable, male domestic partner abuse was measured by an abridged version of Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Appendix I). The scale measures the frequency with which abusive actions occur as well as the degree of its severity. The scale manual indicates that an individual scoring low on the CTS is indicative of someone whose experience with partner abuse is both infrequent and less severe than one scoring high on the same measure. The scale measures both the aspects of prevalence (i.e., abuse ever occurring during the course of a relationship) and incidence (i.e. reports of partner abuse incidents during the past year) of perpetrated partner abuse was assessed by this measure. The scale is made of five sub scales namely: Negotiation, Psychological aggression, Physical assault, Sexual coercion and Injury; although only three dimensions – Negotiation (6-items), Psychological aggression (8-items), and Sexual coercion (7-items) were used after extensive review of the socio-cultural factors surrounding the population. Also, this research instrument is scored in accordance to how many number of times the behaviour occurred in the past six months or one year from a range of occurrence ranging from 0 to 20 times. Sample items from the three selected sub scales stated thus: "respected partners' feelings", "shouted at a partner", "destroyed something of the partner" and forced a partner to have sex". The basis of scoring and interpretation is on the norm score of each of the dimensions as follows Negotiation = 61.6 for male perpetuation; 57.4 for the victimized male; Psychological aggression = 15.1 for male perpetuation; 17.2 for the victimized male, and Sexual coercion 19.9 for male perpetuation; and 18.5 for the victimized male. Participants' mean score above the norm (scale

mean) means the participants are high on the scale whereas participants' mean score below the norm is indicative that the participants are low on the scale. As regards the internal consistence of the scale, Straus (1979) reported high internal consistency of the general scale (Cronbach's Alpha =.79 for males and Cronbach's Alpha =.94 for females). However, for this study, the researcher carried out a pilot study and reported an internal consistence of .69 (Cronbach's alpha).

Procedure

The researcher obtained 51 valid responses from the 60 participants sampled from a population of civil servants, traders and artisans from different senatorial districts in Anambra State. During the study, the researcher approached the participants individually (as with the business men and artisans) or collectively by authorization (as with the civil servants at the state secretariat) and introduced herself as a graduate student carrying out an academic inquiry and needed the cooperation of the participants to gather valuable data.

In the study, the researcher presented the student identification in other to facilitate rapport with the respondents who were approached individually (in case of the business men and artisans) or collectively by authorization (in case of the civil servants at the state secretariat). The students ID card enabled the researcher to introduce herself as a graduate student carrying out an academic inquiry and needed the cooperation of the participants to gather valuable data. Instructions on how to participate in the survey were also given to the participants by the researcher. Clarifications were also made on the survey questions which the participants did not understand. The researcher adopted both purposive (for selecting the sectors) and simple randomization sampling technique for selecting the participants of the study. The researcher also employed the services of 2 NYSC members as research assistants at an agreed stipend to help facilitate the field survey especially in instrument distribution, collation and data coding in order to remain focused on academic timeline. After filling the questionnaire which took an average of 17 minutes, some of the participants submitted back the filled questionnaire directly to the researcher or the research assistants whereas in other cases, the researcher and the research assistants went round and collected from the participants. With the help of the research assistants, the returned filled questionnaire was sorted and only the valid ones were selected for coding and analysis which saw a return rate of 93.6% from 340 questionnaires administered while validity rate of the returned questionnaire was 95.50%. The result of the data analysis was presented in the result section.

Design and Statistics

This study is survey study; the appropriate design adopted was factorial design (1x2) whereas One-way analysis of variance was adopted as appropriate statistic for data analysis. All statistical works will be based on SPSS tool version 21.00.

Findings

Table 1: Descriptive statistics showing participants' group mean score, standard deviation and number on the components of domestic abuse

| Education Level | Income Level | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|-----------------|----------------|---------|----------------|-----|
| High Edu | High Income | 16.4684 | 1.0526 | 49 |
| | Low Income | 17.3706 | 1.2108 | 89 |
| | Total High Edu | 16.9195 | 1.1224 | 138 |
| Low Edu | High Income | 17.0400 | 1.3042 | 74 |
| | Low Income | 18.6615 | 1.5147 | 85 |
| | Total Low Edu | 17.8507 | 1.4530 | 159 |

| | | | | |
|-------|-------------|---------|--------|-----|
| Total | High Income | 16.7542 | 1.0266 | 123 |
| | Low Income | 18.0160 | 1.6255 | 174 |
| | Total | 17.3844 | 1.3504 | 297 |

a. Psychological aggression

From the result above, Table 1 indicated that there is a statistical mean difference between high educational level group (M = 16.91, SD = 1.12, N = 138) and low educational group (M = 17.85, SD = 1.45, N = 159); and between high income group (M = 16.75, SD = 1.02, N = 123) and low income group (M = 18.01, SD = 1.62, N = 174) on male domestic abuse (psychological aggression).

Table 2: Descriptive statistics showing participants' mean score, standard deviation and number on sexual coercion

| Education Level | Income Level | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|-----------------|----------------|---------|----------------|-----|
| High Edu | High Income | 19.1200 | 1.1105 | 49 |
| | Low Income | 20.1455 | 1.3642 | 89 |
| | Total High Edu | 19.6322 | 1.2373 | 138 |
| Low Edu | High Income | 20.3770 | 1.2820 | 74 |
| | Low Income | 21.4040 | 1.4525 | 85 |
| | Total Low Edu | 20.3331 | 1.3513 | 159 |
| Total | High Income | 19.7400 | 1.4460 | 123 |
| | Low Income | 20.7212 | 1.4228 | 174 |
| | Total | 20.1310 | 1.4334 | 297 |

a. Sexual coercion

Result in Table 2 equally indicated that a statistical mean difference exist between high educational level group (M = 19.63, SD = 1.23, N = 138) and low educational group (M = 20.33, SD = 1.35, N = 159); and between high income group (M = 19.74, SD = 1.44, N = 123) and low income group (M = 20.72, SD = 1.42, N = 174) on male domestic abuse (sexual coercion).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics showing participants' mean score, standard deviation and number on negotiation

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|---------|----------------|-----|
| Education Level | Income Level | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
| High Edu | High Income | 60.0383 | 1.6103 | 49 |
| | Low Income | 56.2060 | 1.4649 | 89 |
| | Total High Edu | 58.1171 | 1.8373 | 138 |
| Low Edu | High Income | 57.1010 | 1.5820 | 74 |
| | Low Income | 55.0000 | 1.7525 | 85 |
| | Total Low Edu | 56.5005 | 1.8516 | 159 |
| Total | High Income | 58.5101 | 1.6638 | 123 |
| | Low Income | 55.7030 | 1.7500 | 174 |
| | Total | 57.3002 | 1.8250 | 297 |

a. Negotiation

As regards the third dimension measured, Table 3 also indicated that there is a statistical mean difference between high educational level group (M = 58.11, SD = 1.83, N = 138) and low educational group (M = 56.50, SD = 1.85, N = 159); and between high income

group (M = 58.51, SD = 1.54, N = 123) and low income group (M = 55.70, SD = 1.72, N = 174) on male domestic abuse (negotiation).

Table 4: Two way analysis of variance showing the influence of educational level and income level on male domestic abuse
Dependent variable: Male domestic abuse

| Source | Type II Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Corrected Model | 604.430 | 3 | 201.37 | 9.169 | .000 |
| Intercept | 1836.493 | 1 | 1836.493 | 6.287E | .000 |
| Educational level | 59.40 | 2 | 29.705 | 4.536 | .023 |
| Income level | 46.246 | 2 | 23.123 | 6.593 | .019 |
| Educational level*Income level | 9.00 | 2 | 4.500 | 3.613 | .037 |
| Error | 45.350 | 294 | | | |
| Total | 2053304.044 | 297 | | | |
| Corrected Total | 5382.347 | 296 | | | |

Based on the statistical mean difference observed in the descriptive result above, 2-way analysis of variance was run and the result indicated that the observed statistical mean difference among the groups reached significant proportions at $F(1, 297) = 4.53, p < .05$ and $F(1, 297) = 6.59, p < .05$ respectively for educational level groups and income level groups (see Table 4). There was also a significant interaction effect between educational level groups and income level groups at $F(1, 297) = 3.61, p < .05$.

The observed significant mean differences imply that men with high educational level, and high-income level reported less male domestic abuse than their counterparts with low educational level, and income level. The observed differences meant that educational level and income level influenced male domestic abuse and the interaction of both will further influence the prevalence of male domestic abuse. Owing to the significant difference ascertained, hypotheses I, II and III were confirmed.

Discussion and Conclusion

The current study explored the influence of socio-economic status (education level and income level) on male domestic abuse among a population of married men living in Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria. After extensive review of literature, it was established that despite the low reportage of male domestic abuse; it is a growing public health concern which required an investigation especially as regards its causes and factors which influence and sustain its prevalence. The concept perceived as a misnomer because of the dominant influence of the patriarchal family system in most sub-Saharan Africa, differences in socio-economic status was deemed to significantly contribute to its prevalence among the population.

Ensuating from the above, the design of the study sought to account for any observable significant differences between on dimensions of male domestic abuse which are influenced by differences in the socio-economic status namely; victims' education level and income status. This design led to the testing of three hypotheses as itemized in the purpose of the study. After data analysis, the result indicated that significant differences were observed in the abuse scores of the participants across all the socio-economic strata and that an interaction effect exists between educational level and income level on the influence of male domestic abuse. Hence, hypotheses I, II and III were confirmed on the influence educational level, income level on male domestic abuse and the interaction of both on male domestic abuse.

In hypothesis I which states that males with high educational qualification will experience less domestic abuse than males with low educational qualification was confirmed. The finding is indicative of that high mean score on psychological aggression and sexual coercion means that males with low educational level experience more domestic abuse in forms of psychological aggression and sexual coercion while low mean score on negotiation signifies that males with low educational level experience high negotiation abuse also. Therefore, the finding confirms that males with low educational qualification experience more domestic abuse (psychological aggression, sexual coercion and negotiation dimensions) than males with higher education qualification.

Considering the influence of our socio-economic status on family stability and the influence of education on the standard of living in most developing countries, the accounted difference in the experience of male domestic abuse (negotiation, psychological aggression and sexual coercion) is consistent with literature and theoretical underpinning of male domestic abuse construct. The current study has therefore provided empirical evidence which complements that resource control which high education may be privy to has enamours influence on male domestic partner abuse. This is a confirmation that males with low education as reported low domestic abuse difference across the three dimensions (negotiation, psychological aggression and sexual coercion) will experience high male domestic abuse than their counterparts with high educational level.

Apart from theoretical provisions which support the causal linkage between socio-economic status and male domestic abuse, the finding in hypothesis I also seemed to have been supported by empirical evidence provided by previous research efforts. For instance, the study done by Okhakhume, Rotimi, and Aroniyaso (2016) found that adversely, increase in the rate of conduct disorder, low self-esteem, low education standard, drug dependence/alcoholism and sexual risk behaviour were associated with family with domestic violence. According to their study, more domestic violence experiences are more likely to emanate from households with low educational level, low self-esteem and high drug dependence. Also, findings from the study done by Khar (2017) on the role of female education on intimate partner violence in households of Pakistan demonstrated that there is relationship between female education and intimate partner violence (IPV). In their study the observed effects of higher education are seen to disproportionately benefit women of relatively higher economic status, in rural samples. In urban samples, however women of all economic status benefit from higher education. These findings are consistent with Goode's (1971) resource theory and Hotaling and Straus (1980) which emphasized that the relationship between education and IPV is highly interdependent with the socio-economic status and the placement of the woman in the household. Kar's (2017) finding is important as it provides evidence for accounted differences across the socio-economic status so, also, Usia, Yang, Pengangguran, Terhadap, Oleh, Pada, Suzane, Hazizan, XMeng, Lim, Wee Te Hung, Winarto, and Maidarti's (2013) study on the influence of age, low education and unemployment on intimate partner violence among women which revealed that lifetime prevalence of female abuse in Puskesmas Makassar population with physical violence, sexual violence and emotional abuse may be associated with partner's socio-demographic.

Equally, hypothesis II which states that males with high income level will experience less domestic abuse than males with low income level was also confirmed. Another dimension of socio-economic status was also tested in this hypothesis. The study intends to establish with the aid of empirical result whether male abusive experience was more with differences in their income level. The result was also uniform with hypothesis I on income level differences; the result confirmed that the mean score of participants with low income level indicated high male domestic abuse experiences (negotiation, psychological aggression and sexual coercion) than the mean scores of their counterparts with higher income level. The finding shows that high mean score on psychological aggression and sexual coercion implicated high domestic abuse whereas low mean scores on negotiation implicated domestic abuse among the low income level male population. Therefore, the finding confirmed that males with low income level experience more domestic abuse (psychological aggression, sexual coercion and negotiation dimensions) than males with high income level.

The findings in hypothesis II above is similar to the finding found of income level differences in a study carried out by Ogun-tayo, Oyeleke, Popoola, Opayemi, and Faworaja (2018) on the influence of socio-economic factors on domestic violence among couples in Ibadan which also confirmed that there was significant difference in domestic violence based on marital status and income of the couples. Their result confirmed that there is no significant difference of domestic violence based on gender, religion, family type and child bearing. However, significant differences on domestic violence were accounted on groups with income level differenc-

es. Also, study by Ribeiro, Silva, Alves, Batista, Ribeiro, Schraiber, Bettiol and Barbieri (2017) on the effects of socioeconomic status and social support on violence against pregnant women using a structural equation modeling analysis. Ribeiro et al (2017) study found that pregnant women with lower socioeconomic status reported more episodes of physical/sexual violence than their counterparts with high socio-economic status. This effect of socioeconomic status was indirect and mediated by low social support which was associated with more episodes of general, psychological and physical/sexual violence.

Practically, it should be considered that in Nigeria, as a developing nation, education and means of income and actual income represents parameters of inferring a man's chances of success because of it offers opportunity for employment and provision for the family. Therefore, there is theoretical expectation at least that men with less economic power (education and high income level) or income capacity are most likely to be looked down upon by their partners and to large extent are abused verbally, psychologically, and most likely sexually. This aligns with the current empirical finding which have shown that males with low education and low income level are more vulnerable to domestic abuse experiences that those that have high education and high income level,

Finally, hypothesis III ascertained significant interaction effect between educational level and income level on male domestic abuse. Considering that both hypothesis I and II implicated socio-economic factors (educational and income level), there is a theoretical expectation that interaction effect is possible with low educational level and low income level expected to be the most vulnerable group of male domestic abuse (negotiation, psychological aggression and sexual coercion). The result of the study equally confirmed the expected interaction effect with participants from low education and low income level having higher mean score on psychological aggression and sexual coercion dimension but lower mean score on negotiation dimension. The finding is indicative that a combination effect of low socio-economic factors would increase male domestic abuse experiences such as low education with low income level.

The existing interaction effect is supported by the study findings of Usia, Yang, Pengangguran, Terhadap, Oleh, Pada, Suzane, Hazizan, XMeng, Lim, Wee Te Hung, Winarto, and Maidarti (2013) on the influence of age, low education and unemployment on intimate partner violence among women. The effect of socio-economic factors on the prevalence of violence in women showed that lifetime prevalence of female abuse in Puskesmas Makassar population may be associated with her partner's socio-demographic factors. Also, by Okhakhume, Rotimi, and Aroniyaso's (2016) study which found that adversely, increase in the rate of conduct disorder, low self-esteem, low education standard, drug dependence/alcoholism and sexual risk behaviour were associated with family with domestic violence was also provided relevant support to the study.

Recommendations

- It is recommended that other studies need to be carried to establish causative factors and other consequences of male domestic violence as a public health concern.
- There is also the need to control extraneous and moderating variables.
- There is also the need to compare homogenous sample and heterogeneous sample of domestic abuse to ascertain the prevalence, sustenance and consequences which will also gift literature empiricism since it is an emerging study focus.

References

- Ackerson, L. K., Kawachi, I., Barbeau, E. M., & Subramanian, S. V. (2008). "Effects of individual and proximate educational context on intimate partner violence: A population-based study of women in India." *American Journal of Public Health*, 98, 507–514.
- Bell, A. S., Dinwiddie, M., & Hamby, S. (2018). Gender patterns in intimate partner violence: Result from 33 campus climate surveys based on Partner Victimization scale. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.34326.86086.
- Caldwell, J.E; Swan, S.C; Woodbrown, V.D (2012). "Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes". *Psychology of Violence*. 2: 42–57. [doi:10.1037/a0026296](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026296)
- Chaudhuri, T. (2012). Patterns of Male Victimization in Intimate Relationships: A Pilot Comparison of Academic and Media Reports. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 20(1), 57-72.
- Corbally, M. (2015). Accounting for Intimate Partner Violence: A Biographical Analysis of Narrative Strategies Used by Men Experiencing IPV From Their Female Partners. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 30(17), 3112-3132. doi:10.1177/0886260514554429
- Dienye, P.O., & Gbeneol, P. K. (2009). Domestic Violence Against Men in Primary Care in Nigeria. *American Journal of Men's Health* 3(4) 333–339
- Esquivel-Santoveña, E.E; Lambert, T.L; Hamel, J (2013). Partner abuse worldwide. *Partner Abuse* 4(1): 6–75. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.4.1.6
- Gallup World Poll (2013). New Measures of Global Income. Gallup Metrics. www.news.gallup.com/poll/worldwide-median-income-per-capita.
- Gjertson, L. M. (2011). Summary of Workshop Proceedings: Exploring the Intersection between Financial Capability and Domestic Violence. (CFS Issue Brief 2011-5.7). Center for Financial Security, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Goldberg, C. (1999). Spouse abuse crackdown, surprisingly, nets many women. *New York Times*, p. A16.
- Hogan, K. (2016). *Men's experiences of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence: A qualitative exploration* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the West of England).
- Ifeanyi-Obi, C.C., Agumagu, A.C & Iromuanya, P. (2017). Socio-economic Determinants of Domestic Violence Suffered by Rural Women Crop Farmers in Imo State. *Journal of Agricultural Extension (EJS)*, 21(1), 153-165.
- Lubker, D.K.V. (2004) Socioeconomic Status and Domestic Violence. *International Journal of Global Health and Health Disparities*, 3(1), 84-92. <http://scholarworks.uni.edu/ijghhd/vol3/iss1/10>
- Office of Violence Against Women, (2007). About domestic violence. Retrieved June 13, 2007 from: <http://www.isdoj.gov/ovw/domviolence.htm20/07/2015>.
- Oguntayo, R. (2015). Influence of Emotional Intelligence, Personality Traits and Marital Satisfaction on Domestic Violence among Couples. University of Ibadan, The Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Psychology. An Unpublished MSc Thesis.
- Oguntayo, R., Oyeleke, J.T, Popoola, O.A., Opayemi, A.S. & Faworaja. O. R. (2018). Influence of socio-economic factors on domestic violence among couples in Ibadan. *ESUT Journal of Psychological Science*, 13(1), 14-27.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scales. *Journl of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 75-88.
- Swan, S.C.; Gambone, L.J.; Caldwell, J.E.; Sullivan, T.P.; Snow, D.L. (2008). A Review of Research on Women's Use of Violence with Male Intimate Partners. *Violence and Victims* 23(3): 301–314.

Trinh, O. T. H., Oh, J., Choi, S., To, K. G., & Do, D. V. (2016). Changes and socioeconomic factors associated with attitudes towards domestic violence among Vietnamese women aged 15–49: findings from the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys, 2006–2011. *Global health action*, 9(1), 29577.

UNICEF (2015). Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) Available from: <http://www.un.org.vn/vi/media/releases.360>

Vanguard Newspaper. (2015, August 5). I Beat My Wife for Refusing Sex, Man Tells Court in Ikorodu, Lagos. 35-37. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardnewspaper.ng> on 29/08/2018.

Vanguard Newspaper. (2016, August 25). Several cases of Domestic Violence. Retrieved from <http://www.vanguardnewspaper.ng> on 29/09/2018.

WHO (2013). [Violence against women: fact sheet no. 239](#). Geneva, Switzerland. World Health Organization

WHO (2013a). Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence. Geneva: World Health Organization.

WHO (2015). Child maltreatment. Geneva, Switzerland. World Health Organization.

WHO (2015). Elder abuse. Geneva, Switzerland. World Health Organization.

