Forms and Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Married Secondary School Teachers in Anambra State

A.I. Ogbalu, Iwuji, Ngozi Frances¹, Nnaemezie, Nkiru Onyinyechukwu²

^{1,2}Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

Corresponding Author: Nnaemezie, Nkiru Onyinyechukwu

ABSTRACT

This study examined forms, risk factors and health hazards of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State. Four research questions and four hypothesis guided the study. The study used a descriptive survey research design. The population of the study comprised 2600 married teachers (male and female) in all secondary schools owned by Anambra State. The sample consisted of 1080 married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State. The instrument used data collection for was а structured questionnaire titled Domestic Violence Questionnaire (DVQ). The DVQ was validated by experts in measurement and evaluation as health education. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was 0.947. Mean and standard deviation statistics were used to answer the research questions. T-test and ANOVA were used to test null hypotheses at .05 level of significance. The findings revealed among others that forms of domestic violence such as physical injuries, depression, abortion and others exist among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State. Risk factors of domestic violence such as low self-esteem, economic stress, unhealthy family relationship, distrust, sexual dissatisfaction and others exist among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State. Based on the findings, it was recommended among others that, health educators should provide a platform to educate married teachers in various secondary schools on the need to avoid domestic violence so as to have a peaceful environment at home. Married teachers should endeavour to learn and

understand each other as this will enable them avoid any form of violence at home.

Keywords: Domestic violence, risk factors, health hazards, married secondary school teachers, Anambra State

INTRODUCTION

Violence is a social disorder. It is physical destabilization and distortion of peace and order in interpersonal relationship and in society as it includes assault, occasioning injury, threats and damage to property (Chikobi and Ezumezu, 2018). Violence is showing physical force especially unlawful kind or emotional intensity to an individual (another person). The World Health Organisation (WHO, 2015) defined it as the intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group or community, which results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation. Violence in homes (Domestic violence) has been part of the fabrics of many societies and cultures worldwide. It is common place that it has often gone unnoticed and failed to receive the level of concern it deserves in light of the devastating effect on children and families (Igbokwe, Ukwuma & Onugwu, 2013).

In fact, it can happen between or among persons in a home. (Chikobi & Ezumezu, 2018). Domestic violence

includes behaviours that physically harm, arouse fear, prevent a partner from doing what they wish or force them to behave in ways they do not want. It includes the use of physical and sexual force, threats and intimidation, emotional abuse. and economic deprivation. Many of these different forms of domestic violence can be occurring at the same time within the same intimate relationship (Hotline, 2017). Domestic violence can affect anyone of any age, or gender whether it is physical or psychological. Domestic abuse is destructive for both the battered and the batterer.

Domestic violence is abuse that happens in a physical, verbal, emotional, economic, religious, and reproductive and sexually abuse, which can range from subtle, coercive form to marital rape and to violent physical abuse such as choking, beating, female genital mutilation and acid bath that results in disfigurement or death, domestic murder including stoning, bride, honour killings and dowry death (Web-MD, 2017).

Forms of Domestic violence noted by Medline – Plus (2017) include physical abuse. This involves constant intending to cause pain, injury, other physical suffering or bodily harm. For example hitting, shoring, grabbing, pinching, biting, hair pulling among others. According to World Health Organization (2015) sexual abuse is any sexual act, attempting to obtain a sexual act. unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic or otherwise directed against a person sexuality using Coercion. This includes, but not limited to marital rape, attacks on sexual parts of the body, forcing sex after physical violence has occurred, or treating one in a sexually demeaning manner. There is also emotional abuse as form of domestic violence. According to WHO (2015) emotional abuse as a domestic violence is a pattern of behaviour that threatens, intimidates, dehumanizes or systematically undermines self-worth. This includes constant criticisms, name – calling or damaging ones relationship with his or her children.

On the other hand, there is economic abuse as a form of domestic violence. Adams, Sullivan, Bybel and Greenson cited in Amenda (2013) stated that economic abuse as a form of violence when one intimate partner has control over the other partner's access to economic resources. Marital assets are used as a means of control. It can also mean as making or attempting to make an individual financially dependent by maintaining total control over financial resources, withholding one's access to money or forbidding one's attendance to school or employment. Social abuse is another form of domestic violence. According to WHO (2015), it involves causing fear by intimidation, threatening physical harm to partner, children or partner's family or friends, destruction of pets and property and forcing isolation from family, friends, school or work. Another form of domestic violence is digital abuse. WHO (2015) stated that it is the use of technologies such as texting and social networking to bully, harass, stalk or intimidate a partner. It is usually perpetrated online e.g. accepting or not accepting year friendship on social network. Sending insulting or even threatening e-mails, face book messages online to the victims, sending unwanted explicit pictures and demanding some in return, steals or insists on tracing password, accessing personal phones, checking upon pictures, texts and outgoing calls frequently and also using any kind of technology to monitor their victim(s).

A growing number of research has been conducted into the risk factors associated with domestic violence and its three domains (Sabir& Campbell, 2015; Aduloju, Olagbuji, Olofirbiyi & Airoleke, 2015; Bamiwuye & Odimegwu, 2014). A multi-country study by the WHO confirmed that domestic violence is widespread across all countries with the prevalence ranging between 4% and 75% (Garcia-Moreno et al, 2005). Several risk factors of domestic

violence, such as being young in age, low level of education, poverty, place of residence, exposure to violence between parents, sexual abuse during childhood and a general acceptance of violence have been consistently identified in the literature.

Gender is а construct that distinguishes organisms on the basis of their reproductive roles. In recent times, many forms of gender are being recognized aside the traditional male and female. However, for the purpose of this study, gender is classified into male and female. Literatures proved that women experiencing domestic violence more than men. Yusuf (2000) confirmed that a large number of women reported their abuse to family and friends while not many decided to go to police to file a report. Another veritable variable of interest is duration of marriage. Duration of marriage refers to the interval of time between the day, month and year of marriage to date often expressed in completed years (OECD Glossary of Statistical Terms, 2006). Obi and Ozumba (2007) in a related study linked duration of marriage and couple age disparity as major factors to domestic violence. Iliyasu, Abubakar, Babashan and Galadanci (2011) supported the view that duration of marriage is a strong predictor of domestic violence. Issues surrounding domestic violence are much with it adverse health implication that is why this study tends to determine how gender and duration of marriage determines the forms and health hazards of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study is to determine the forms, risk factors and health hazards of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State. Specifically, the study aims at determining the following:

1. forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on gender;

- 2. forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on duration in marriage;
- risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state based on gender;
- risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on duration in marriage;

Significance of the Study

The findings of the study will be of benefits to many persons and groups of amongst whom health persons are educators. health officers. couples (especially married secondary school teachers), guidance counsellors, education agencies (such as ministry of education, post primary school services commission, universal basic education board), law enforcement agencies (such as the police, civil defense), social welfare officers, the judiciary, churches, education and sociology researchers, curriculum developers, book writers and general public.

Research Questions

The following nine (4) research questions will guide the study.

- 1. What are the forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on gender?
- 2. What are the forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on duration in marriage?
- 3. What are the risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state based on gender?
- 4. What are the risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on duration in marriage?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses will guide the study and will be tested at 0.05 level of significance:

1. Forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in

Anambra State will not be significantly based on gender.

- 2. Forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state will not be significantly based on duration of marriage.
- 3. Risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state will not be significantly based on gender.
- 4. Risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state will not be significantly based on duration of marriage.

METHOD

The descriptive survey research design was used for the study. According to Nworgu (2015), descriptive survey design is concerned with collecting data from a sample of a population in order to describe conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident or trends that are developing. The design is suitable for the present study because the study intends to use questionnaire to collect the opinions of the respondents on risk factors and health hazard of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State.

The sample for this study comprised one thousand and eighty (1080) married secondary school teachers in Anambra State. The sample represents 40 percent of the entire population of 2,600.Data that was analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer the research questions and t-test and ANOVA statistics to test the hypotheses. The decision rule is that any item with mean score of 2.50 and above was regarded as agree, whereas any item with a mean score less than 2.50 was be regarded as disagree.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected and the results. The analyses of the research questions and hypotheses are presented one after the other using tables. A summary of findings of the study is also presented.

Research Question 1: What are forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on gender?

S/N	Items	Male		Remark	Female		Remark	
		х	SD		х	SD		
1	Physical assault not intended to injure	2.01	1.06	Disagree	2.93	1.06	Agree	
2	Physical assault intended to injure	3.04	1.04	Agree	2.00	0.95	Disagre	
3	Display of wish to bring upon physical assault	2.10	1.02	Disagree	3.13	0.95	Agree	
4	Imposition of thought/Ideas	3.11	1.04	Agree	3.03	0.88	Agree	
5	Fighting	3.10	0.95	Agree	3.21	0.92	Agree	
6	Quarrelling	3.14	0.86	Agree	3.08	0.94	Agree	
7	Control	3.02	0.94	Agree	3.10	1.00	Agree	
8	Destruction of valuables	3.01	1.09	Agree	2.06	0.98	disagree	
9	Sexual abuse	1.95	0.97	Disagree	1.91	0.90	Disagre	
10	Raising voice in disharmony	2.02	0.90	Disagree	2.97	1.00	Agree	
11	Deprivation of comfort	3.00	1.04	Agree	3.05	0.98	Agree	
12	Scolding	2.99	1.00	Agree	3.03	0.97	Agree	
13	Stalking	2.86	1.08	Agree	3.18	0.96	Agree	
14	Economic abuse	1.92	0.85	Disagree	3.07	1.00	Agree	
15	Emotional abuse and intimidation	3.05	1.00	Agree	3.39	0.86	Agree	
16	Isolation	3.07	0.97	Agree	1.89	0.94	Disagre	
17	Using male privilege	1.96	0.87	Disagree	3.27	0.83	Agree	
18	Starving	2.92	1.02	Agree	1.94	0.89	Disagre	
19	Withdrawal of social privileges	1.74	0.84	Disagree	3.21	0.93	Agree	
20	Withdrawal of economic privileges	3.00	1.07	Agree	3.21	0.93	Agree	
21	Throwing away food	3.00	1.07	Agree	1.90	0.88	Disagre	
22	Pouring of hot water	1.73	0.85	Disagree	1.86	0.91	Disagre	
23	Bitting	1.90	0.97	Disagree	1.87	0.81	Disagre	
24	Drugging	1.96	0.97	Disagree	1.85	0.89	Disagre	
	Grand Mean/SD	2.57	0.98	Agree	2.67	0.93	Agree	

 Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Forms of Domestic Violence among Marriage Secondary School Teachers in Anambra

 State Based on Gender

Result of Table 2 indicates mean and standard deviation scores of forms of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender. The analysis reveals that more of the items were rated above a mean score of 2.50 by the respondents. This implies that phobia, poor self-esteem, multiple sexual partners among others are forms of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender. The responses by these male and female teachers are evident in a grand mean score of 2.57 and 2.67 respectively. The grand standard deviation scores of 0.98 and 0.93 indicate that male and female married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State do not have varied view on forms of domestic violence.

Research Question 2: What are forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers based on duration in marriage?

 Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Forms of Domestic Violence among Marriage Secondary School Teachers in Anambra

 State Based on Duration in Marriage

S/N	Items	1-10	years	Remark	11-20	years	Remark	21 yrs	& Ab.	Remark
		x	SD		x	SD		х	SD	
1	Physical assault not intended to injure	3.31	0.67	Agree	3.08	0.92	Agree	2.74	1.18	Agree
2	Physical assault intended to injure	1.58	0.82	Disagree	1.92	1.00	Disagree	1.87	0.91	Disagree
3	Display of wish to bring upon physical assault	1.95	0.99	Disagree	2.91	1.06	Agree	3.23	0.89	Agree
4	Imposition of thought/Ideas	3.06	0.97	Agree	3.06	0.97	Agree	2.78	1.06	Agree
5	Fighting	2.81	1.04	Agree	3.24	0.90	Agree	3.14	1.00	Agree
6	Quarrelling	3.24	0.89	Agree	2.98	1.02	Agree	3.18	0.87	Agree
7	Control	3.11	0.85	Agree	2.94	0.97	Agree	3.20	0.98	Agree
8	Destruction of valuables	1.79	0.80	Disagree	1.90	0.89	Disagree	1.88	0.87	Disagree
9	Sexual abuse	1.92	0.93	Disagree	1.82	0.95	Disagree	1.89	0.88	Disagree
10	Raising voice in disharmony	3.13	0.88	Agree	3.16	0.92	Agree	3.15	0.99	Agree
11	Deprivation of comfort	3.11	0.97	Agree	3.03	0.99	Agree	3.12	0.95	Agree
12	Scolding	2.96	1.06	Agree	3.19	0.91	Agree	3.06	1.02	Agree
13	Stalking	2.98	1.01	Agree	2.91	1.08	Agree	3.14	1.00	Agree
14	Economic abuse	3.10	0.96	Agree	2.96	1.09	Agree	3.11	0.88	Agree
15	Emotional abuse and intimidation	3.17	0.95	Agree	3.25	0.83	Agree	3.11	1.01	Agree
16	Isolation	2.00	0.96	Disagree	1.94	0.87	Disagree	1.77	0.90	Disagree
17	Using male privilege	3.08	0.97	Agree	3.26	0.85	Agree	3.04	0.98	Agree
18	Starving	1.60	0.68	Disagree	1.70	0.79	Disagree	1.79	0.81	Disagree
19	Withdrawal of social privileges	3.32	0.77	Agree	3.11	0.96	Agree	3.13	1.00	Agree
20	Withdrawal of economic privileges	3.32	0.77	Agree	3.11	0.96	Agree	3.13	1.00	Agree
21	Throwing away food	1.66	0.58	Disagree	1.78	0.78	Disagree	1.95	0.88	Disagree
22	Pouring of hot water	1.86	0.94	Disagree	1.78	0.90	Disagree	2.05	1.01	Disagree
23	Bitting	1.91	0.98	Disagree	2.00	1.00	Disagree	2.48	1.18	Disagree
24	Drugging	2.05	0.95	Disagree	1.98	1.05	Disagree	2.17	1.11	Disagree
	Grand Mean/SD	2.58	0.89	Agree	2.62	0.94	Agree	2.67	0.97	Agree

Table 3 shows mean and standard deviation scores of forms of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on duration in marriage. In addition, the Table 3 shows that the respondents rated more of the items above a mean score of 2.50, this reveals that stress, eating disorder, anxiety, harmful alcohol among others are forms of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on duration in marriage. Furthermore, the grand mean scores of 2.58,

2.62 and 2.67 are empirical evidence supporting the agreement among the respondents. The grand standard deviation scores of 0.89, 0.94, and 0.97 show that married teachers in different age brackets had similar opinion on forms of domestic violence.

Research Question 3: What are the risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on gender?

S/N	Items	Male		Remark	Fema	le	Remark
		х	SD		х	SD	
25	Low self-esteem	3.32	0.82	Agree	2.76	1.29	Agree
26	Low income	3.14	0.98	Agree	2.87	1.15	Agree
27	Low academic achievement	3.13	0.92	Agree	3.20	0.95	Agree
28	Young age	1.60	0.77	Disagree	2.47	0.94	Disagree
29	Heavy alcohol and drug use	3.09	0.79	Agree	2.87	1.08	Agree
30	Prior History of being physical abusive	2.94	0.99	Agree	3.31	1.04	Agree
31	Emotional dependence and insecurity	3.03	1.05	Agree	3.19	0.84	Agree
32	Belief in strict gender roles	3.26	0.69	Agree	3.13	1.03	Agree
33	Desire for power and control in relationship	3.11	0.98	Agree	2.84	1.02	Agree
34	Unplanned pregnancy	3.06	0.80	Agree	2.90	1.01	Agree
35	Jealousy and possessiveness	3.07	0.42	Agree	2.86	1.10	Agree
36	Economic stress	3.08	0.84	Agree	3.17	0.94	Agree
37	Unhealthy family relationship and interaction	3.11	0.92	Agree	3.03	1.04	Agree
38	Association with anti-social and aggressive peers	3.27	1.02	Agree	3.05	0.71	Agree
39	Social Isolation	2.71	0.92	Agree	2.87	0.80	Agree
40	Poverty overcrowding and unemployment	3.14	0.84	Agree	2.70	1.06	Agree
41	Weak community sanctions	3.21	0.93	Agree	2.61	1.05	Agree
42	Cultural norms that support aggression toward others	3.27	0.84	Agree	2.76	1.12	Agree
43	Traditional gender inequality	3.22	0.88	Agree	2.83	1.05	Agree
44	Weak health, educational economic and social policies/laws	3.26	0.91	Agree	2.57	1.08	Agree
45	Poor neighborhood support and cohesion	2.95	0.98	Agree	2.67	1.03	Agree
46	Lack of social support	3.26	0.92	Agree	2.76	0.98	Agree
47	Martial instability -divorces	2.99	1.00	Agree	3.34	0.83	Agree
48	Hostility towards women	3.14	0.83	Agree	3.50	0.66	Agree
49	Witnessing intimate partner violence as a child	3.19	0.99	Agree	2.66	1.03	Agree
50	Incompatibility	3.06	1.04	Agree	3.07	1.07	Agree
51	Sexual dissatisfaction	2.86	1.09	Agree	2.89	1.02	Agree
52	Education disparity	3.30	0.67	Agree	2.76	1.12	Agree
53	Distrust	2.79	1.08	Agree	3.45	0.69	Agree
54	Uncompromising business/job schedules	3.08	1.02	Agree	2.64	1.09	Agree
55	Interest difference	3.18	0.93	Agree	2.98	1.15	Agree
56	Religious incompatibility	3.25	0.71	Agree	3.03	1.01	Agree
57	Withdrawal of comfort	2.89	1.06	Agree	2.86	1.04	Agree
58	Insults	3.30	0.92	Agree	2.90	1.01	Agree
59	Withdrawal of health where the victim is sick	3.39	0.74	Agree	2.82	1.11	Agree
	Grand Mean/SD	3.07	0.89	Agree	2.92	1.00	Agree

 Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Marriage Secondary School Teachers in

 Anambra State Based on Gender

Male = 207, Female = 873

Result of Table 5 reveals mean and standard deviation scores of risk factors of domestic violence married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender. The analysis shows that more of the items were rated above a mean score of 2.50, this implies that social isolation, lack social of support, low academic achievement, jealousy, possessiveness among others are risk factors of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender. The evidence is shown in a grand mean score of 3.07 and 2.92 respectively. The grand standard deviation scores of 0.89 and 1.00 indicate that the male and female teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State had same view on risk factors of domestic violence.

Research Question 4: What are the risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on duration in marriage?

 Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Marriage Secondary School Teachers in

 Anambra State Based on Duration in Marriage

S/N	Items	1-10 years		Remark	11-20 years		Remark	•	rs &	Remark
								Ab.		
		х	SD		х	SD		х	SD	
25	Low income	3.22	0.98	Agree	2.77	1.07	Agree	3.02	0.98	Agree
26	Low academic achievement	3.35	0.93	Agree	3.13	0.93	Agree	2.93	0.97	Agree
27	Young age	2.82	1.01	Agree	1.82	1.02	Disagree	3.10	0.92	Agree
28	Heavy alcohol and drug use	2.25	0.99	Disagree	3.08	0.87	Agree	1.97	1.00	Disagree
29	Prior History of being physical abusive	2.89	0.88	Agree	3.25	0.78	Agree	2.92	1.04	Agree
30	Emotional dependence and insecurity	2.89	0.96	Agree	3.32	0.86	Agree	3.09	0.93	Agree

		Table	4 Cont	inued						
31	Belief in strict gender roles	3.35	0.91	Agree	3.06	0.83	Agree	2.86	1.06	Agree
32	Desire for power and control in relationship	3.27	0.84	Agree	3.08	1.06	Agree	3.03	0.91	Agree
33	Unplanned pregnancy	3.32	0.96	Agree	3.40	0.69	Agree	3.14	0.88	Agree
34	Jealousy and possessiveness	2.90	0.87	Agree	3.25	0.75	Agree	3.25	0.79	Agree
35	Economic stress	2.93	0.94	Agree	3.14	0.78	Agree	3.08	1.01	Agree
36	Unhealthy family relationship and interaction	3.31	0.95	Agree	3.07	0.94	Agree	2.91	1.02	Agree
37	Association with anti-social and aggressive peers	3.06	0.96	Agree	3.11	0.87	Agree	3.04	1.00	Agree
38	Social Isolation	3.27	0.94	Agree	3.30	0.69	Agree	3.21	0.89	Agree
39	Poverty overcrowding and unemployment	2.82	0.90	Agree	3.18	0.78	Agree	3.09	1.05	Agree
40	Weak community sanctions	3.09	0.73	Agree	3.29	0.75	Agree	2.96	0.99	Agree
41	Cultural norms that support aggression toward others	2.81	0.90	Agree	3.22	0.82	Agree	3.04	1.02	Agree
42	Traditional gender inequality	3.02	1.15	Agree	3.06	0.98	Agree	3.17	0.91	Agree
43	Weak health, educational economic and social policies/laws	3.30	0.95	Agree	3.16	0.90	Agree	3.10	0.96	Agree
44	Poor neighborhood support and cohesion	2.90	0.83	Agree	3.19	0.90	Agree	2.94	0.96	Agree
45	Lack of social support	2.99	0.79	Agree	3.21	0.86	Agree	3.19	0.92	Agree
46	Martial instability -divorces	2.79	0.91	Agree	3.26	0.84	Agree	3.23	0.85	Agree
47	Hostility towards women	3.28	0.93	Agree	3.07	0.92	Agree	3.05	0.94	Agree
48	Witnessing intimate partner violence as a child	2.76	0.87	Agree	3.28	0.75	Agree	3.26	1.04	Agree
49	Incompatibility	3.12	1.02	Agree	3.05	0.89	Agree	2.92	1.03	Agree
50	Sexual dissatisfaction	2.70	0.98	Agree	3.04	0.95	Agree	3.32	0.84	Agree
51	Education disparity	3.36	0.89	Agree	3.26	0.99	Agree	2.88	1.03	Agree
52	Distrust	2.69	1.00	Agree	3.06	0.96	Agree	3.21	0.77	Agree
53	Uncompromising business/job schedules	2.58	0.98	Agree	3.36	0.74	Agree	3.37	0.72	Agree
54	Interest difference	2.69	0.79	Agree	3.06	1.00	Agree	3.31	0.75	Agree
55	Religious incompatibility	3.03	1.03	Agree	2.87	1.07	Agree	3.18	1.04	Agree
56	Withdrawal of comfort	3.13	1.19	Agree	3.37	0.76	Agree	3.34	0.89	Agree
57	Insults	2.92	0.78	Agree	3.30	0.74	Agree	3.23	0.84	Agree
58	Withdrawal of health where the victim is sick	3.32	0.88	Agree	3.13	0.87	Agree	3.33	0.81	Agree
59	Low income	2.83	1.18	Agree	2.94	1.10	Agree	3.08	0.95	Agree
	Grand Mean/SD	3.00	0.94	Agree	3.12	0.88	Agree	3.08	0.94	Agree

Analysis on Table 6 mean and standard deviation scores of risk factors of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on duration in marriage. In addition, Table 3 shows that more of the items were rated above a mean score of 2.50 which reveals that marital instability, interest difference, insults, withdrawal of comfort among others are forms of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on duration in marriage. The grand mean scores of 3.00, 3.12 and 3.08 are empirical evidence supporting the agreement among these respondents. The grand standard deviation scores of 0.94, 0.88, and 0.94 show that married teachers in various age brackets had same opinion on risk factors of domestic violence.

Hypothesis 5: Forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers is not significant based on gender

Table 5: Test of Difference between Mean Ratings of Forms of Domestic Violence among Married Secondary School Teachers in Anambra State Based on Gender

Gender	Ν	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig
Male	207	42.7198	7.97744	1078	-3.530	.411
Female	873	45.0309	8.58205			
			n > 0.05			

Table 10 reveals that t-test was run to test the difference in the mean ratings of forms of domestic violence based on gender. The result shows no significant difference given that t-value = -3.530 and p > 0.05 (.411 > 0.05), thus, the null hypothesis was accepted that the difference in mean ratings of forms of domestic violence based on gender is not significant.

Hypothesis 6: Forms of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers is not significant based on duration in marriage

 Table 6: Test of Difference between Mean Ratings of Forms of Domestic Violence among Married Secondary School Teachers in Anambra State Based on Duration in Marriage

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.				
Between Groups	220.222	2	110.111	1.589	.205				
Within Groups	74646.578	1077	69.310						
Total 74866.800 1079									
p > 0.05									

Analysis on Table 11 shows that ANOVA was run to test the difference in the mean ratings of forms of domestic violence based on duration of marriage. The analysis reveals no significant difference given that $F_{(2,1077)} = 1.589$, and p > 0.05(.205 > 0.05), hence, the null hypothesis is accepted that the difference in mean ratings of forms of domestic violence based on duration in marriage is not significant.

Hypothesis 7: Risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State is not significant based on gender

 Table 7: Test of Difference between Mean Ratings of Risk

 Factors of Domestic Violence among Married Secondary School

 Teachers in Anambra State Based on Gender

reachers	Teachers in Anamora State Based on Gender										
Gender	Ν	Mean	SD	df	t	Sig					
Male	207	45.7536	8.93842	1078	3.327	.147					
Female	873	43.6346	8.06428								
p > 0.05											

Table 12 shows that t-test was run to test the difference in the mean ratings of risk factors of domestic violence based on gender. The result shows no significant difference given that t-value = 3.327 and p > 0.05 (.147 > 0.05), therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted that the difference in mean ratings of risk factors of domestic violence based on gender is not significant.

Hypothesis 8: Risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State is not significant based on duration in marriage

 Table 8: Test of Difference between Mean Ratings of Risk Factors of Domestic Violence among Married Secondary School Teachers in Anambra State Based on Duration in Marriage

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	499.119	2	249.559	4.211	.015
Within Groups	63834.433	1077	59.271		
Total	64333.552	1079			

P < 0.05

Data presented on Table 13 indicates that ANOVA was run to test the difference in the mean ratings of risk factors of domestic violence based on duration of marriage. The analysis reveals a significant difference given that $F_{(2,1077)} = 4.211$, and p < 0.05 (.015 < 0.05), hence, the null hypothesis is rejected that the difference in mean ratings of risk factors of domestic violence based on duration in marriage is significant. Then, a Tukey post hoc test revealed a significant difference for secondary school married teachers in the age brackets of 11-20 years, 21 years and above given that .016 < .05. However, the difference between mean scores of secondary school married teachers in the age bracket of 1-10 years is not significant given that .709 > .05.

DISCUSSION

Finding of this study revealed that risk factors of domestic violence such as low self-esteem, economic stress, unhealthy family relationship. distrust. sexual dissatisfaction and others exist among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State. More so, the findings revealed that there are risk factors of domestic violence such as low self-esteem, stress. unhealthy family economic relationship, distrust, sexual dissatisfaction among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender, and, these risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on gender is not significant. The findings also revealed that risk factors of domestic violence such as marital instability, interest difference,

insults, withdrawal of comfort and others exist among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on duration in marriage, and, these risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra State based on duration in marriage is significant. Similarly, Recep, Ertan, Ali, Metihan and Begum (2016) found that 33.6% of women investigated have experienced domestic violence and 78% had experienced domestic violence for the first time in their relationship with the current partner.

CONCLUSIONS

forms of There are domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender and duration in marriage. Risk factors of domestic violence exist among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender and duration in marriage. Finally, there are health hazards of domestic violence among married teachers in secondary schools in Anambra State based on gender and duration in marriage.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were made;

Health educators should provide a platform to educate married teachers in various secondary schools on the need to avoid domestic violence so as to have a peaceful environment at home. Married teachers should endeavour to learn and understand each other as this will enable them avoid any form of violence at home. Government agencies such social welfare among others saddled with the responsibilities of handling domestic violence should do their work without fear or favour to ensure that anyone found wanting in any form of domestic violence faces the law, this will serve as deterrents to others in the society.

Limitation of the Study

One of the limitations of this present study is the fact that some married teachers were not free to give information during data collection.

Acknowledgement: None

Conflict of Interest: None

Source of Funding: None

REFERENCES

- 1. Amanda, M.S. (2013) Measuring abusive behaviors: is economic abuse a unique form of abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 28(16) 3186–3204.
- 2. Aduluju, P.O., Olagbiyi, N.R., Olofinbiyi, A.B., & Awoleke, J.O. (2015). Prevalence and predictors of intimate partner violence among women attending fertility clinic in South-Western Nigeria. *European Journal* of Oba.
- Chikobi, P.C. (2012). Basic ecological and environmental concepts in F.U. Akindo, K. Azubuike and S.O. Eneasator (eds) ecological and environmental education. An introduction. Onitsha: New Lincel publishers, pp. 46-48.
- 4. Chikobi, P.C. and Ezumezu, M.U. (2018). *Teenage pregnancy in developing societies like Nigeria abound*. (Onitsha: New crest publishers) pp.237-210.
- 5. Ezumezu, (2018). Sexual health education for intervention for young people: A Methodology Review British Medical Journal, 310-362.
- 6. Holine (2017) marital conflict. Retrieved on 1/5/2017 from *www.holine.com/maritialconflict*.
- Igbokwe, CC, Ukwuma CM, Onugwu KJ. (2013) Domestic violence against women: challenges to health and innovation. *JORIND. 11 (2):27-35.*
- 8. Iliyasu, Z., Abubakar, I.S., Babashani, M. & Galadana, H.S. (2011). Domestic violence among women living with HIV/AIDS in Kano, Northern Nigeria. African Journal of Reproductive Health.
- 9. Medline-Plus (2017). Meaning of domestic violence retrieved from *https://medlineplus.gov/domesticviolen ce.html*

- 10. Obi, S.N. & Ozumba, B.C. (2007). Factors associated with domestic violence in SOuthEast Nigeria. *Journal of Gynecology*
- 11. Sabri, B. & Campbell, J.C. (2015). Intimate partner violence against women in slums in India. India Journal of Medical Research 141, 757 – 759. https//doi.org/10.4103/0971-5916.160693
- 12. Web-MD (2017) what is domestic violence. retrieved from https://www.webmd.com/mentalhealth/mental-whatis-domestic-abuse#1
- 13. World Health Organization (2011) Intimate partner and sexual violence against women. Violence against Women. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- 14. World Health Organization (2015) Putting women first: *Ethical and safety*

recommendations for research on domestic violence against women.

15. Yusuf, F.A. (2017) Impacts of domestic violence against women on students' academic performance as perceived by primary school teachers in Nigeria. *Educational Journal of the University of Patras UNESCO Chair* 4(2) 17-25

How to cite this article: A.I. Ogbalu, Iwuji, Ngozi Frances, Nnaemezie, Nkiru Onyinyechukwu. Forms and risk factors of domestic violence among married secondary school teachers in Anambra state. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2021; 8(10): 58-67. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr. 20211010
