

EFFECTS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ON THE LIVELIHOOD OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS OF MUPUN ETHNIC GROUP IN PLATEAU STATE, NIGERIA.

Abdullahi¹, A., Salihu¹, I.T. Jibrin¹, S., Pojwan², D., Hassan², S., Aliyu², A.

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,

²Department of Agricultural Economics and Farm Management,

Federal University of Technology Minna, Niger State, Nigeria.

Email - abdulwahababdullahi6@gmail.com. 07061848379

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the effect of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households in Plateau State, Nigeria. Interview schedule complimented with questionnaire were used to obtain information from a total of 124 respondents. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentages and mean. The results revealed that majority of the farmers were married (69.5%) and educated (96.8%) with a mean age of 39years. The result also shows that farmers suffers from various kinds of violence from their partners ranging from physical (mostly (97.6%) by hitting, kicking, slapping and beating), psychological (mostly (96.8%) by yelling and screaming) and sexual violence (mostly (99.2%) by withholding sex). While the existing social norms, traditions and culture (\bar{X} =4.23), extra marital affairs (\bar{X} =4.17) and alcoholism (\bar{X} =3.98) were the major causes of domestic violence among rural households. These attributes and traditions had negative effects on farmers' livelihood in the manner of decline in social interaction with other farmers (\bar{X} =4.56), decrease productivity in labour input (\bar{X} =4.55) and decrease adoption of new technologies (\bar{X} =4.35). However, farmers believed that economic empowerment of women (\bar{X} =4.48), removing norms against gender mainstreaming (\bar{X} =4.45) and avoiding force/arranged marriage (\bar{X} =4.43) and dialogue with kinsmen (\bar{X} =4.42) were perceived as the most effective strategies to curbing domestic violence in the area. Thus, it was recommended that rural famers should be given adequate orientations on marital affairs as well as the health implications of domestic violence on rural economy.

Keywords: Domestic Violence, Gender, Livelihood, Strategies, Rural households.

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence (DV) is one of the most widespread but least recognized human rights abuse in the world. It refers to any harm perpetrated against a person's will on the basis of gender (the socially ascribed differences between males and females) (Walker *et al.*, 2019). DV takes place worldwide, irrespective of age, sex, religion, class or caste, the shocking truth is that violence against

women and girls takes place in all countries, in homes, schools and communities (Walker *et al.*, 2019). The impact of this global epidemic is far reaching and accounts for as much death and ill-health in women aged 15-44 years as cancer does (Ugwu *et al.*, 2016), it is a greater cause of ill-health than malaria and traffic accidents combined (World Bank, 2014). The World Health Organization (WHO) in 2012 recognized that if we fail to address violence against women, many of the agreed global poverty eradication targets will be compromised because is not only a human rights abuse but also an economic drain.

Domestic Violence is a growing public health and human right problem in Nigeria; one in three women are said to have experienced a form of DV (Emenike *et al.*, 2008). The act of DV cut across religion, social class and ethnic groups and some Nigerian traditions harmful to women which includes; intimate partner violence (IPV), overt physical abuse (rape, battering, sexual assault, torture, mutilation, at home, street or in the workplace); psychological abuse (deprivation of liberty, forced marriage, sexual harassment, at home, street or in the workplace); deprivation of resources needed for physical and psychological well-being (health care, nutrition, education, means of livelihood); treatment of women as commodities (sexual slavery, forced impregnation, trafficking in women and girls for sexual exploitation) (Oladepo *et al.*, 2011). Intimate partner violence (IPV) is said to be the commonest and most pervasive form of (DV) in Nigeria (WHO, 2012).

Despite strong evidence showing a rising trend of Domestic violence in Nigerian communities, the act remains shrouded in secrecy and the silence surrounding DV in Nigeria contributes to the poor reporting of cases and even when reported, there is lack of appropriate mechanisms to effectively respond to survivors needs (Ugwu *et al.*, 2016). The health facility has been described as most often the first point of call for DV survivors, however service providers were found to be poorly trained and equipped with referral services to respond to DV survivors appropriately. To this end, this study was conceived to assess the effect of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households in Plateau State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of the

respondents, examine the patterns of domestic violence, ascertain the causes of domestic violence and ascertain effect of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households as well as the effectiveness of the existing curbing strategies to domestic violence in study area.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Pankshin and Mangu LGA of Plateau State, Nigeria. The State is located on latitude 08°24'N and longitude 008°32' and 010°38' east (National Bureau of Statistic (NBS), 2017). It has a total land area is about 30,913Km². The mean annual rainfall in the state is 131.75cm to 146cm with an average temperature of 27°C (NBS, 2017). As at 2006, it has a population of 3,206,531 people (National population commission (NPC), 2006) and the projected figure of 4,200,400 people in 2016 using growth rate of 3.5 percent (NBS, 2017). In order to obtain a sample frame for this study, a list of registered farmers was obtained from Agricultural Development Project (ADP). Multi-stage sampling technique was used in selecting respondents for this study. The first stage involved a random selection of two Local Government Areas (LGAs) of the State. The second stage involved a random selection of six (6) villages across the selected LGA. The third stage involved a random selection of two (2) focus groups from each village. The last stage involved the use of Yamane formula to select sample

size from the sample frame which gave a total of 124 respondents. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire and interview schedule and analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentages, frequency distribution, and mean). A 5-point Likert rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Undecided (U) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2 and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 was used to identify the causes and effect of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households while the effectiveness of the existing coping strategies to domestic violence among rural farming households was examine using Very Effective (VE) = 5, Effective (E) = 4, Undecided (U) = 3, Not Effective (NE) = 2 and Not Very Effective (NVE) = 1. The decision rule of mean (\bar{X}) scores ≥ 3.0 indicates an agreement, while scores < 3.0 indicate disagreement.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic Characteristics of the respondents

The result in the table 1 shows that majority (79.8%) of the respondent were between the age bracket of 30-50 years with an average age of 39 years. This implies that, the respondents are in their productive age to participate on various farming and other related activities. The finding agrees with the result of Oladepo *et al* (2011) which revealed that People in that age grade are often productive, economically active and innovative in agricultural production.

Table 1: Distribution of socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Variable	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)	Mean
Sex:			
Male	63	50.8	
Female	61	49.2	
Total	124	100.0	
Age:			
30 years and below	37	29.8	39
30-40 years	37	29.8	
41-50 years	25	20.2	
Above 50 years	25	30.2	
Income Status:			
100,000 and below	70	56.5	27,096.77
100,001-200,000	47	37.9	
Above 200,000	7	5.6	
Educational Status:			
Primary	11	8.9	
Secondary	47	37.9	
Tertiary	62	50.0	
Adult	4	3.2	

Sources: field survey, 2021

Education equips individuals with the necessary knowledge of how to make a living and as well help them to break out from ancient traditions and practices that promotes domestic violence. With respect to the

educational status, the highest proportion (87.9%) of the respondents in the study area attended both tertiary and secondary level of education. This implies that majority of the respondents are well educated and are therefore

equipped with the knowledge of curbing DV. This result corresponds with the result of Adebayo (2020) who stated that a rise in education at the rural level will naturally cripple domestic violence whose impact has done much disservice to agriculture and the livelihood of farmers for decades now. With regards to the income status of the respondents, the table shows that the average annual income of the respondents was (N27,097). This result implies that most of the farming households in the study area are not high-income earners. Therefore, the ability of the farmers to diversify into various aspect of farming is reduced. This result also agrees with the result of Ahmed *et al.* (2018) who reported that most rural people are financially constrained thus affecting agricultural livelihood.

Pattern of domestic violence

Physical Violence: This involves the use of physical force in a way that puts partner at the risk of being injured. From table 2, the result revealed that most of the rural farmers had experienced one or multiple form of physical violence and suffered various kinds of pains which could affect their level of productivity and livelihood. Thus Hitting, kicking, slapping, beating (97.6%) and Pulling or ripping out hair (96.8%) are the most common form of physical domestic violence that occurs in the study area. This result is in line with Adebayo (2020) who stated that physical form of violence is the most experienced form of domestic violence in the study area, leading to women being unproductive.

Psychological Violence: This involves threatening or harming a partner's sense of self-worth by putting him/her at risk of serious behavioral, cognitive,

emotional or mental disorders. From the Table, majority of the farmers suffers Yelling, screaming, rampaging (96.8%) and Humiliating partner in public or private places (79.8%) are the most pronounced form of psychological violence in the area. This result agrees with the findings of Obi and Ozunba (2007) who revealed that psychological violence such as Shouting at a partner was found to be the most common abuse among the rural people.

Sexual Violence: This include all forms of sexual assaults, harassment or exploitation. From table 2; withholding sex from partner (99.2%) is the most predominant form of sexual violence experienced among rural households in the area. This experience makes it less likely for the farmers to be in the right state of mind to carry out their daily farming function as expected. This result is also in line with the research of Oladebo *et al.* (2011) who stated that withholding sex from partner in an attempt to punish them could affect households' livelihood as the concentration needed to be productive is divided.

Economic abuse: This includes stealing from or defrauding a loved one, withholding money for essential things like food and medical treatment, failure to provide for dependents who may be adults or children and preventing an individual from working or controlling his/her choice of occupation. Table 2 shows that economic violence is a common practice in the study area as over 90% of the respondents claimed to have experienced multiple form of economic violence such as denying the right to work and earn income and refusal to pay children school fees, food and clothes. These forms of violence reduce farmers' labour productivity due to hunger and emotional instability.

Table 2: Patterns of domestic violence among rural households

Patterns of domestic violence	Yes F (%)	No F (%)
Physical Violence:		
Throwing things/objects in anger	20(16.1)	104(83.9)
Intimate partner abuse	39(31.5)	85(68.5)
Pulling or ripping out hair	120(96.8)	4(3.2)
Hitting, kicking, slapping, beating	121(97.6)	3(2.4)
Holding victim hostage	7(5.6)	117(94.4)
Psychological Violence:		
Name calling (ugly, bitch, whore, prostitute)	39(31.5)	85(68.8)
Emotional blackmail and suicidal threatens	55(44.4)	69(55.6)
Hurting or killing pets in front of family members	37(29.8)	87(70.2)
Yelling, screaming, rampaging	120(96.8)	4(3.2)
Humiliating partner in public or private places	99(79.8)	25(20.2)

Sexual Violence:		
Sexual assault	22(17.7)	102(82.3)
Taking nude pictures of partner and threaten to upload online	33(26.6)	91(73.4)
Sexual rape	17(13.8)	106(86.2)
Withholding sex from partner	123(99.2)	1(0.8)
Threatens to tell friends about your sexual orientation	6(4.8)	118(95.2)
Contacting victim using objects and methods against their will	11(8.9)	113(91.1)
Economic violence:		
Denying partner the right to work and earn income	113(91.1)	11(8.9)
Solely controlling how, when and where money is spent	114(91.9)	10(8.1)
Forcing partner to sign documents against their will	6(4.8)	118(95.2)
Refusal to pay children school fees, buy food or buy clothes	107(86.3)	17(13.7)
Having all bank account name in the abuser's name	8(6.5)	116(93.5)

Sources: field survey, 2021
 F=frequency and %= Percentage

Causes of domestic violence

The findings from Table 3 indicated that, majority of the respondents affirmed that social norms, traditions and culture (\bar{X} =4.23), extra marital affairs (\bar{X} =4.17) and alcoholism (\bar{X} =3.98) were the major causes of domestic violence against women. This could be due to the culture and tradition of the rural areas that allows men

domination over women, thus giving some men upper power to abuse this traditional right over women through violence at the slightest mistakes. This result is also in line with the findings of Oladepo *et al.* (2011) who reported that social and traditional norms like the system of bride price makes some men feel total ownership of women, therefore claiming them as their property.

Table 3: Causes of domestic violence in the study area.

Causes of domestic violence	SA(%)	A(%)	U(%)	D(%)	SD(%)	\bar{X}	Rank
Social norms, traditions and culture	47(37.9)	60(48.4)	16(12.9)	1(0.8)	0(0)	4.23	1 st
Extra marital affairs	48(38.7)	64(51.6)	3(2.4)	3(2.4)	6(4.8)	4.17	2 nd
Alcoholism	41(33.1)	56(45.2)	14(11.3)	7(5.6)	6(4.8)	3.98	3 rd
Marital infidelity	23(18.5)	51(41.1)	17(13.7)	16(12.9)	17(13.7)	3.78	4 th
Forced [arranged marriage	17(13.7)	16(12.9)	17(13.7)	51(41.1)	23(18.5)	2.62	5 th
Poverty	15(12.1)	20(16.1)	9(7.3)	41(33.1)	39(31.5)	2.44	6 th
Lack of education(illiteracy)	11(8.9)	17(13.7)	10(8.1)	59(47.3)	27(21.8)	2.24	7 th
Polygamy	8(6.5)	11(8.9)	8(6.5)	68(54.8)	29(23.4)	2.20	8 th
Disrespect	8(6.5)	6(4.8)	25(20.2)	44(35.5)	41(33.1)	2.16	9 th

Source: Field survey, 2021.

Mean scores ≥ 3.0 = major cause, % = percentages, and \bar{X} = Mean

Note: SA-Strongly Agreed; A-Agreed; U-Undecided; D- Disagree; SD-Strongly Disagree.

Effects of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households

The result on Table 4 shows that, DV reduces social interaction with other farmers (\bar{X} =4.56), decrease productivity in labour input (\bar{X} =4.55) and decrease adoption level of new technologies (\bar{X} =4.35) were the major perceived effects of DV on the livelihood of rural farming households in the study area.

Table 4: Perceived effects of domestic violence on the livelihood of rural farming households.

Perceived effect of domestic violence	SA	A	U	D	SD	\bar{X}	Rank
DV reduces social interaction with other farmers	70(56.5)	54(43.5)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	4.56	1 st
DV decreases productivity in labour input	48(38.7)	64(51.6)	3(2.4)	3(2.4)	6(4.8)	4.55	2 th
DV decreases adoption of new technologies	66(53.2)	45(36.3)	7(5.6)	2(1.6)	4(3.2)	4.35	3 rd
DV decreases effectiveness in products marketing	27(21.8)	59(47.6)	10(8.1)	17(13.7)	11(8.9)	4.34	4 th
DV reduces willingness to access rural resources	52(41.9)	65(52.4)	5(4.0)	0(0)	2(1.6)	4.33	5 th
DV decreases self-esteem among farmers network	47(38.2)	60(48.4)	16(12.9)	0(0)	1(0.8)	4.23	6 th
DV lower standard of living in farming business	39(31.5)	41(33.1)	9(7.3)	20(16.1)	15(12.1)	4.17	7 th
DV decreases participation in farming activities	66(53.2)	45(36.3)	7(5.6)	2(1.6)	4(3.2)	4.02	8 th
Reduce family overall income	16(12.9)	62(50.0)	14(11.3)	24(19.4)	8(6.5)	3.87	9 th
DV reduces interest to life and farming operations	23(18.5)	51(41.1)	17(13.7)	16(12.9)	17(13.7)	3.78	10 th
DV makes partner handicap in farming activities	47(38.2)	59(48.0)	12(9.8)	0(0)	5(4.1)	2.56	11 th
DV results taking hard substances to forget experience	8(6.5)	11(8.9)	8(6.5)	68(54.8)	29(23.4)	2.20	12 th

Source: Field survey, 2021.

Mean scores ≥ 3.0 = major effect, % = percentages, and \bar{X} = Mean

Note: SA-Strongly Agreed; A-Agreed; U-Undecided; D- Disagree; SD-Strongly Disagree.

This implies that the respondents often find it challenging to interact with other farmers especially for marketing and technology-sharing purposes thus, resulting low productivity. This finding collaborates with the result of Adebayo (2020) who indicated that domestic violence could result to withdrawal from the society as well as inability to be productive both on and off field hence, grossly affect household livelihood security.

Effectiveness of the strategies to curbing domestic violence in rural households

The Findings from Table 5 shows the e strategies to curbing domestic violence in the study area. From the result; economic empowerment of spouse (\bar{X} =4.48), Removing norms against gender mainstreaming

(\bar{X} =4.45), avoiding force/arranged marriage (\bar{X} =4.43) and dialogue with kinsmen (\bar{X} =4.42) were perceived by the respondents as the most effective strategies to curbing domestic violence in the study area. Thus, Government and NGOs should empower rural women with economic resources in other to promote gender equality and create financial stability for the rural farmers. Similarly, norms that encourages gender disparity and fuels domestic violence should be abolish as this has negative health implications and by extension negatively affects agricultural livelihood. This result is consistent with the findings of Ambrosetti *et al.* (2013) and Olubumi and Otufale (2012) who stated that Government and NGOs interventions, dialogue with kinsmen and speaking up against violence are some of the surest ways of preventing and reducing acts of domestic violence in rural areas.

Table 5: effectiveness of the existing strategies to curbing domestic violence

Existing curbing strategies to domestic violence	VE(%)	E(%)	U(%)	NE(%)	NVE(%)	\bar{X}	Rank
Economic empowerment of spouse	68(54.8)	49(39.5)	0(0)	6(4.8)	1(0.8)	4.48	1 st
Removing norms against gender mainstreaming	62(50.0)	56(45.2)	6(4.8)	0(0)	0(0)	4.45	2 nd
Avoiding force/arranged marriage	67(54.0)	45(36.3)	10(8.1)	2(1.6)	0(0)	4.43	3 rd
Dialogue with kinsmen to resolve social differences	66(53.2)	50(40.3)	4(3.2)	2(1.6)	2(1.6)	4.42	4 th
Publicly punishing domestic violence perpetrators	49(39.5)	65(52.4)	10(8.1)	0(0)	0(0)	4.42	5 th
Publicly celebrating families who exists peaceful over period of years	58(46.8)	60(48.4)	6(4.8)	0(0)	0(0)	4.42	6 th
Enforcing laws that protects female partners	61(49.2)	55(44.4)	6(4.8)	2(1.6)	0(0)	4.41	7 th
Periodic organisation of marriage orientation programs	56(45.2)	61(49.2)	6(4.8)	0(0)	1(0.8)	4.38	8 th
Periodic sex education at the grass root level	54(43.5)	63(50.8)	7(5.6)	0(0)	0(0)	4.38	9 th
Encouraging couples to attend community functions together	53(42.7)	63(50.8)	8(6.5)	0(0)	0(0)	4.36	10 th
Banishing serious perpetrators of domestic violence	54(43.5)	62(50)	5(4.0)	3(2.4)	0(0)	4.35	11 th

Perpetrators bearing medical responsibility and compensation of victims	55(44.4)	59(47.6)	10(8.1)	0(0)	0(0)	4.34	12 th
Abolishment of traditions favouring DM	50(40.3)	66(53.2)	8(6.5)	0(0)	0(0)	4.31	13 th

Source: Field survey, 2021.

Mean scores ≥ 3.0 = major effect, % = percentages, and \bar{X} = Mean

Note: Very Effective (VE), Effective (E), Undecided (U), Not Effective (NE) and Not Very Effective (NVE)

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusively, farmers suffer significant forms of physical, psychological, sexual and economical violence which are majorly caused by existing social norms, traditions, alcoholism and extra marital affairs thus, leading to reduction in the level of social interaction among farmers, decrease in labour inputs and productivity thereby, affecting farmer's livelihood both physically, mentally and socially. It was therefore recommended that rural farmers should be provided with adequate orientations on marital affairs. Youths and couples in particular should be encouraged to collectively embrace fight against domestic violence in their Homes. Farmers association should sensitize members against DV and publicly punish perpetrators by withholding required farming inputs.

REFERENCE

- Adebayo, B. (2020), 'Nigerian State Governors Resolve to Declare State of Emergency on Rape Following Spate of Sexual Violence,' CNN, 12 June 2020, <https://edition.cnn.com/2020/06/12/africa/nigeria-state-of-emergency-rape/index.html>.
- Ahmed, M. T., Bhandari, H., Gordocillo, P. U., Quicoy, C. B., and Carnaje, G. P. (2018). Factors affecting extent of rural livelihood diversification in selected areas of Bangladesh. SAARC Journal of Agriculture, 16(1), 7-21.
- Ambrosetti, E., Abu Amara, N., and Condon, S. (2013). Gender-based violence in Egypt: Analyzing impacts of political reforms, social, and demographic change. Violence Against Women 19(3): 400-421. doi:10.1177/1077801213486329.
- Emenike E, Lawoko S, Dalal K. (2008). Intimate partner violence and reproductive health of women in Kenya. Geneva: International Council of Nurses; 2008.
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), (2016). Available online: Retrieved from <http://nigeria.opendataforafrica.org/xspplpb/nigeria-census>: Last updated: Tuesday, 31 May 2016.
- National Population Commission of Nigeria (NPCN) (2016). Available online: Retrieved from <https://www.citypopulation.de/php/nigeria-admin.php?adminId=NGA027>: 21 March, 2016.
- Obi, S. N., & Ozumba, B. C. (2007). Factors associated with domestic violence in south-east Nigeria. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, 27, 75-78. doi:10.1080/01443610601056509
- Oladepo, O., Yusuf, O.B. & Arulogun O.S., (2011) GBV, Factors influencing gender based violence among men and women in selected states in Nigeria. (African journal of reproductive health) 15 (4) p78.
- Olubumi, S. & Otufale, O (2012). Assessment of domestic Violence among women in Ogun State Nigeria. Green Journal of social sciences vol.2(4).
- Ugwu, E., Christian, C., Obioji, J. & Okechukwu, I. (2016). Gender Based Violence in Nigeria, The trends and ways of forward. specialty journal of politics and law, 2016 (1): pp 99-115.
- Walker, A., Lyall, K., Silva, D., Craigie, G., Mayshak, R., Costa, B., Hyder, S., & Bentley, A. (2019). Male victims of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence, help-seeking, and reporting behaviors: A qualitative study. Psychology of Men & Masculinities, 21(2), 213-223. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000222>
- World Bank (2014). Agriculture public expenditure review at the federal and sub-national levels in Nigeria. The World Bank Country Office, Abuja.
- World health Organization, (2012). The world health report 2012: Mental health: new understanding, new hope. World health Organization.