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Abstract

The fabrics of society are defined by its cultural values and socio-economic exchanges. What is considered right, acceptable and justified is mostly hinged on its shared values and norms. One of such values is reflected in patriarchy and the preference of the male over the female in most communities in various parts of Nigeria. This has contributed to the incessancy and justification of violence against women aimed at the control and subjugation of the female sex. The relationship between patriarchy (male child) preference and intimate partner violence in Nigeria, particularly the Niger Delta region was investigate in this study. As an empirical investigation, data was generated from 354 respondents using the structured questionnaire and analysis utilized both descriptive and inferential statistical tools. Two null hypotheses were tested with results indicating that male dominance, as well as the low level of education in the male gender, both contributed to intimate partner violence. Based on these findings, it was concluded that patriarchy and the emphasis on the male gender over the female contributes to intimate partner violence in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. It was recommended that there should be awareness creation in churches and in communities on the implication of these obnoxious cultural practices that reduces the female child to a second class citizen.
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1. Introduction

In recent years, advocacy groups and NGOs have tried in bringing people’s attention to oil conflict and violence in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. They are yet to stop the silent danger of intimate partner violence in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. The concern of the public has been on the impact of oil, without addressing the risks of intimate partner
violence. To understand what violence is, a clear definition is needed. It is defined as a situation of abusive behaviour in an intimate relation which is directed towards a current or former spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend. Seimeniuk et al (2010) cited in Alokan (2013), defined Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) as an abusive behaviour by one partner against another in an intimate relationship. This violence is manifested or noticed in the following forms: Physical (kicking, beating, hitting, slapping, restraining or threat to life); Sexual (forced sex, rape and forceful penetration to gain satisfaction); Emotional (controlling, intimidation, stalking and neglect). Economic (stealing money from the wife, withholding money for medical and other essential services, manipulating or exploiting family member for financial gains, preventing her from involving in gainful employment and controlling or deciding her choice of career). Although women often abuse their partners/husbands but male perpetrated violence against a woman is more pronounced (Levin, 2000 and WHO, 2005). This study, therefore, focused on male perpetrated violence on his partner/wife. Kurz (1996) affirmed that women usually leave relationship due to Partner/husband abuse. The author argued that separating from such violent relationship is not an end to abuse.

Globally, statistics show that over 60% of women have been abused, 10-69% of women have been assaulted by their partner (UNFPA 2002) cited in Abayomi (2014). In United States of America, the total number of physical assault and rape stands at 4.8 million and statistics revealed that every year, 1000-1600 women die in the hands of their intimate partners. In West Africa, 6 out of every 10 women suffered abuse in the hands of their partner/husbands, physical assault stands at 45%, denial of resources and opportunities 42% and 11% suffer psychological or emotional abuse (IRC, 2012). In Nigeria, the prevalence varies between different regions and states. In South West Nigeria, the prevalence is 24%,31% in Western Nigeria (Ibadan and Lagos), 39% in Anambra and 79% in Imo state (Antai and Antai,2009).However, in the South- South region, (Ogwu, 2014, Daily Trust, Saturday, October 17, 2015) report showed that the South-South had the highest cases of domestic violence with 52.2% of their “despondence” experiencing domestic violence, while the North West had the least with only 6.9% prevalence.

This study investigates the relationship between patriarchy and intimate partner violence in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. The study contributes to existing literature gap in research studies which have examined the nature of intimate partner violence especially with reference to the culture of patriarchy and the dominance of male over female. Its identification of patriarchy as a possible antecedent to intimate partner violence is hinged on the observed societal values and norms prevalent amongst the people of the Niger Delta region of Nigeria.

**Objectives of the study**

The aim of this research is to investigate the relationship between patriarchy and intimate partner violence in selected states in the Niger Delta, Nigeria.

i. To explore the relationship between patriarchy (male child preference) and intimate partner violence

ii. Evaluate the relationship between level of education in male and intimate partner violence.
Research Questions
The following research questions are put forward to guide the researcher in the course of this research.

i. What is the relationship between patriarchy (male child preference) and intimate partner violence?

ii. What is the relationship between the level of education in men and intimate partner violence?

Research Hypotheses
This research is guided by the following hypotheses:

\( H_1 \): The more patriarchy (male child preference), the more intimate partner violence

\( H_2 \): The lower the education in men, the higher intimate partner violence.

The Study Area
Niger Delta is one of the World’s largest deltas with coastal plain of almost 70,000 kilometres (Peterside, 2016). As explained by the author, the conventional geographical perimeter extends from the Benin River in the West to Imo River in the east, and from the southernmost tip at Palm Point near Akassa to Aboh in the north where the Niger River bifurcates into two main tributaries. Niger Delta is endowed with very substantial hydrocarbon deposits while crude oil production runs at 2million barrels per day which account for 90% of Nigerian export revenues.

The population has been growing at about 2.7% per annum and the population of Delta, Rivers and Bayelsa stand in excess of 7million. The settlement pattern is nucleated and rural. Farming systems are predominantly peasant, followed by small parcels; short-fallows systems of cultivation, and diversified forms of rural livelihood including fishing and hunting. The region has many ethnic and linguistic complexities with five major linguistic groups. The area is noted for violence, insurgency, kidnapping, hostage taking, crude oil theft, gang wars etc. (Afinotan and Ojakorotu, 2009). During conflicts, women in Niger Delta are subjected to all kinds of violence, such as rape, physical violence which include: beating, maiming, murder and destruction of properties (Ihayere et al, 2014). This implies that Niger Delta states suffered both stranger violence and intimate partner violence. However, (Ogwu, 2014), reports that Niger Delta states had the highest number of domestic violence with Imo (79%), Edo (75.4%), Cross River (65.5%), Akwa Ibom (59.5%) and Bayelsa (56.1%).

2. Literature Review

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)
Intimate partner violence is defined as any type of harmful behaviour directed towards a woman. The United Nations Human Development Report (2010) offered the definition as ‘Any act of gender based violence which results in physical, sexual, psychological harm or suffering to women which include threat, correction and arbitrary deprivation of her liberty either in the public or in private’ This definition simply has to do with beating, biting, pushing, forced sexual intercourse, negligence, deprivation from economic or social engagement, denial of hospital bills and feeding allowances and depriving a woman of her fundamental human rights either at home or in the public’
Intimate partner violence is therefore defined as any form of gender based violence which involves pushing, slapping, biting, threatening with knife or gun, battering, kicking, shoving, intimidation, stalking and economic deprivation, kidnapping, criminal coercion, unlawful imprisonment, preventing a woman from working or controlling her choice of occupation, sexual exploitation, insult, belittlement, abandonment and neglect (Bobonis, Castro and Gonzatez-Brene, 2000 and Alokan, 2014). This study adopted the United Nations (2010) conceptualization of intimate partner violence which includes physical, sexual, emotional/ psychological and economic abuse. Partner in this study refers to former or current husband/ partner, boyfriend or those that are co-habiting. However, intimate partner violence is also perpetrated by a woman against the husband but male violence against the woman is more pronounced (Jewkes, 2002 and Levin, 2000).

**Global statistics of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)**

All over the world irrespective of culture and religion, women suffer from all forms of violence from their partners. Such violence include: physical, sexual, emotionally/ psychological and economic abuse from their partners/husbands. Around the world, at least one out of three women are beaten, coerced into sex or otherwise abused during her lifetime (WHO, 2004). Globally, one out of three had suffered physical violence from their intimate partners. UNFPA (2002) cited in Abayomi (2014) affirms that 10-60% suffered physical violence from their partners/husbands while in USA, alone, stands 4.8 million (Tjaden, 2000), the same report opined that every year, 1000-1600 women die due to partner abuse.

Similarly, Zambia Demography Health Survey, (2001-2012), report a total of 27% increase, while in rural Ethiopia, WHO, (2005) cited in Abayomi reported 47% and Ghana had the highest number of Physical assault from their male partners/husbands (Alhie, 2009). According to the Worlds Women report (2015), physical violence ranges from 6% in Comoros to 64% in Democratic Republic of Congo. This report indicated that Africa had the highest prevalence with 50% prevalence while prevalence was lower across Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean and Oceania with 40% respectively. Similarly, Uganda had 45% in 2006 and decline to 35% in 2011 while Rwanda had 26% in 2005 and increase to 44% in 2010. In the same report, European countries report showed that women that experience physical and sexual violence in their lifetime ranged from 15% in five counties-Austria, Croatia, Poland, Slovenia and Spain to 35% in Denmark and Latvia.

For sexual violence by an intimate partner/husband, (WHO, 2005) cited in Abayomi, 59% of Ethiopian women suffered sexual abuse from their intimate partners/husbands. In the same vein, Zambia Demography Health Survey affirms that 13% of 15-19 years had been sexually coerced in Zambia. According to Saidi et al (2008), the variation occur due to under-reporting, shame, stigma and other social and cultural factors that hinder women from reporting. According to Worlds Women Report (2015), Azerbaijan women had 7% of psychological/emotional violence in 2006, Peru had 68% in 2013 while lifetime prevalence was higher in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean and Bangladesh had 72% respectively. European countries also report high rate of psychological and emotional violence. Similarly, women that experience economic abuse stand at 17% respectively while justification for wife beating in Africa, Asia and Oceania and lower in Latin America and developed societies. The level of women acceptance

**Intimate Partner Violence: The Nigerian experience**

According to UNICEF (2001) cited in Abayomi (2014), beating of wives and children in Nigeria is a tradition that is sanctioned as a form of discipline. The culture believes that beating their children, parents believe they are instilling discipline in them, which is the same way as in husbands beating their wives who are seen as children to be prone to indiscipline which must be curbed. This is so, when the women are economically dependent on the man. A report by Amnesty International (2005) shows that on daily basis, women are beaten and ill-treated for supposed transgressions, raped and murdered by members of their family. In some cases, vicious acid attacks leave them disfigured. One in three of all women and girls aged 15-24 have been victims of intimate partner violence (IPV). Women both married and unmarried have been subjected to vicious attacks from men, rape, sexual insult and assault, brutalization and victimization.

According to NDHS (2008), 45% of women had experienced violence from their current partners, 7% from their former partner/husband. Among ever married women, 61% reported that their current husbands/partners were involved in the abuse while 9% reported that their former partners did not. In the same report, 7% of women aged 15-49 years had experienced sexual violence, 11% of divorced women, separated or widowed also experience abuse but women who are currently married showed 6% of sexual violence. By zoning, the report argued that violence ranged from 3% in the North West and South West to 12% in South-East and 13% in South-South (see table in appendix). The various forms of violence experienced by these women are: physical or sexual. The study indicated that about 30% of Nigerian women had experienced either physical or sexual intimate abuse. About one in five (5) women experienced physical violence from their husbands/partners, 21% experienced only sexual abuse while 5% experienced both physical and sexual violence. Domestic violence on girls has been on the increase in Nigeria, and victims do not report to the right agencies for fear of embarrassment. Records have shown that between 50% and two thirds (2/3) of Nigerian women are subjected to intimate partner violence. In Nigeria sixty-five percent (65%) or more educated women are in these horrible situations as compared to low income counterparts (55%).

Patriarchy is defined as “a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women”. And Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) functions as a means by men to make sure that women conform to the role of a woman within customary practices in the society”. With this notion, a woman’s economic power is not important; her position, like those of children, is being under the control of a man. Men decision to beat, force their wives into sex, intimidating them and other forms of abuse is a private issue and so it should not be a public discussion (Aihie, 2009). Patriarchy has to do with male dominance and control, unequal power relation embedded in the man, the spirit of superiority and roles of a man as head of the family and the woman assigned domestic responsibilities makes the man to regard the women as subordinate in the family irrespective of her economic power and men however sees women as their property and whatever belongs to the woman must be under the control of the partner. In support of the above, Wihbey (2015) confirmed based on a study on causes of intimate partner violence,
1/5 of those questioned agreed that it was acceptable for a partner to hit each other under certain circumstances.

In a study by Project Alert (2000) cited in Abayomi (2014), interviews with women working in the market and other places of work, girls, young women in schools and universities in Lagos, Nigeria, 64% of 45 women interviewed in the work place said they have been beaten by a partner (boyfriend or husband), 56.6% of 48 interviewed market women admitted experiencing such violence. Similar studies in Oyo yielded same results. Obi and Ozumba (2007) indicated that 70% of the respondents reported abuse in their family with 92% of the victims being female partners and the remaining 8% being male. The common form of abuse reported were: shouting at partner (93%), slapping or pushing 77% and punching and kicking 40% (Aihie, 2009). In Igbo communities, 58% of women report battering during pregnancy while 21.3% has been forced to have sexual inter-course by their husbands (Okemgbo et al, 2002).

Gender Scholars Buiten and Naidoo (2016), argued on the perspective of patriarchy. According to them, patriarchal systems contribute to domestic violence. The authors argued that patriarchal system has reduced women to the status of second class sex who are mostly in subordinate positions. Beauvoir (1974) observed that Millet’s theory of subordination affirms that women are dependent sex class under patriarchal domination; this subordination takes the form of exploitation, disregard, discrimination, insult, control, oppression, violence with the family, at place of work and in the society at large. In view of this, Mount argued that patriarchy is an instrument that causes abuse in the family especially in the area of son preference.

WHO (2010) in conjunction with Pan American Health Organization using the ecological model to explain violence against women based on the four major levels of individual, relationship, community and societal factor identify young age, level of education, experiencing violent as a child, harmful use of drugs and alcohol, personality disorder, past history of abuse and acceptance of violence as a corrective measure are factors responsible for partner abused. Alcohol and harmful used of drugs are identified by Lanhey, (2003), Kaufman, (2002), Barnett and Perrin, (2005), Geiles and Corneil, (1990) as causative factor of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). These authors argued that men that use alcohol and hard drugs tend to behave abnormally and in most cases forced their partner into unsafe sex, rape; beating and even exploiting them for their own satisfaction. According to Barnett and Perrin, (2005), Geiles and Corneil, (1990), alcohol usage increases aggression which in most cases leads to rage in families. In affirmation of the above statement, Kaufman (2001) concludes that alcohol effects on the nervous system releases inhibitions by depressing the brain function or suppressing the super-ego function where it result to rage.

Cavanaugh, Loseke and Geiles (2005) contention on the causes of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) centred on learned behaviours. The authors argued that witnessing and experiencing violent as a child contribute to violence at adult age. This is based on Albert Bandura’s ‘‘Social learning theory’’ which postulates that ‘social behaviour is learned primarily by observing and imitating the actions of others’. It is facilitated through concepts such as modelling and observational learning. People especially children learn from environment and seek acceptance from society by learning through influential models. As learned behaviour, intimate partner violence is modelled by individuals, institutions and society, which may influence the perspective of children and adults.
regarding its acceptability. The home is the first point of contact of every child and the primary agent of socialization and the formation of character. More often than not, cycles of violence often starts at home. It is common place of social psychology that violence in the home makes it more likely that the children will be aggressive and prone to violence in later life. Markowitz (2001) affirmed to the learned behaviour perspective. According to him, abusive behaviour is learned when the child observed domestic violence, his own experience of victimization, living in a culture of violence, for instance, violent movies or video games, community norms and cultural beliefs. In view of the above, Jewkes (2001) argued that intimate partner violence is a learned behaviour and so children whose parent suffered such abuse are likely to beat their partners and daughters of women who are beaten are likely to be beaten as adult.

Lack of women civic rights which have been stipulated and guaranteed under the international treaties but are not enforceable also contribute to Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). Statistics revealed that women constitute 140,431,790 populations, with this, only few Nigerian women stand out to enjoy these rights while majority wallows in poverty and powerlessness. Discriminatory legislation further compounded the problem of violence against women in Nigeria, for example, under the criminal code, the penalty for indecent assault against a man is lower than that for a woman. Section 353 provides for punishment of imprisonment for three years for any person that is unlawfully and indecently assaults any male person, while section 360 stipulates imprisonment for two years any person who unlawfully and indecently assaults a woman and a girl. This discriminatory attitude of the drafters of this law, in making the offence more serious when committed on a male more than the female, goes to show a society that thinks little about the gravity of the offence against the female.

In addition, there are certain laws especially in matrimonial cases that interferes with the ability of a woman to escape violent relationship. For instance, one of the grounds for dissolution of marriage under the matrimonial cause Act Sections (15) (2) (C) of 2004 is that the marriage must have broken down irretrievably, that is, that the respondent has behaved in such a way that the petitioner cannot reasonably be expected to live with the respondents. To secure convictions on the grounds of cruelty, petitioner has to satisfy the court that since the marriage end within the period of one year immediately preceding the date of the petitioner the respondent has been convicted of (1) attempted of unlawfully killing the petitioner(2) having committed an offence involving the intentional inflicting of grievous harm on the petitioner. From the above, until the petitioner is able to secure a conviction against the respondents from attempting to kill her or infliction of grievous harm on her, the woman cannot get out of the relationship unlawfully. From the above, weak legal sanctions against intimate partner violence within marriage needs amendment in order to allow battered women to get out of violent relationship.

Other factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) are the belief in the inherent superiority of men and an acceptance of violence as a means of resolving conflict within relationships (UNICEF, 2000, Brent et al; 2000. The gender inequity and power imbalances that characterized sexual relationships are inextricably link to the limited educational and training opportunities for women, which results in their continuous dependence on men. Women in sub-Sahara Africa including those in Nigeria have limited access to cash and credit and to employment opportunities both in formal and informal
sectors (UNICEF, 2000; Brent et al, 2000). These render women economically disadvantaged and vulnerable to physical, emotional and sexual violence.

3. Materials and Methods

Research Design

In this study, the blueprint adopted is a cross-sectional survey design. The research design comprised the quantitative approach in gaining insight of the essence of the issues under investigation. Data for the study was generated through the administration of structured questionnaire copies.

Population of the study

The population of this research consisted of a total number of (4267) married men and women, as well as divorced (as sourced from the marriage registry), within the Government Ministries of four (4) selected states in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria which also included staff of the Ministry of Women Affairs in-charge of violence for each state.

Sample and sampling technique

The sample size for the study was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan 1970 sample size table. A population of 4267 thus had a benchmark sample size of 354. Therefore 354 respondents selected using the simple random sampling method comprised the sample size and representative portion for this study (Sekaran, 2003).

Instrumentation

The study examines the distribution and relationship between two main variables namely: Patriarchy (predictor) and intimate partner violence (criterion). Patriarchy is further examined based on two dimensions: male preference and the level of education in men. Each variable is scaled on a 4-point Likert scale structured as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = undecided, 4 = agree.

4. Data Presentation

The result for the analysis on the variables (patriarchy, level of education in male and intimate partner violence) is presented in this section. Analysis is based on quantitative tools and variable distributions are assessed using frequencies, central tendencies and standard deviations. Presented in Table 1 below is the result for the reliability analysis on the instruments for each variable examined.

Table 1: Reliability results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Alpha Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimate Partner Violence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchy (Male dominance)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level in men</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicates substantial reliability scores. This indicates that the instruments hold considerable data consistency and replicability.
Figure 1 illustrates the distribution for the state categories of the participants of the study. The results revealed a higher proportion of the respondents were residents of Edo state (29.4%); followed by the frequency for the category of respondents who were resident in Rivers State (24%); next is the category for respondents who were residents in Imo State (23.7%) and then finally respondents who were residents in Akwa Ibom State (23%).

Figure 2: Distribution of the respondents according to qualifications

The distribution for the qualification of the respondents as depicted in figure 2 revealed that a majority of the respondents attained BSc degrees (34%); followed by the frequency for the respondents that obtained OND/HND certificates (28%); followed by the frequency for the respondents who had obtained secondary school certifications (25%); followed by the category of the respondents who were holders of MSc degrees...
(6%) then the category for PhD (2%) and then the category for MA and First school leaving certifications (2%) with the least frequency for the BA degree (1%).

**Figure 3: Data distribution for the variables of the study**

The data (figure 3) indicates that all three variables were significantly manifested as experienced and observed by the respondents of the study. The result of the analysis supported evidence for the distribution of the three variables as being substantial based on the results of their central tendencies where Y (Intimate partner violence = 2.9903) and X₁ (Patriarchy = 2.8282) and X₃ (Low level of education in men = 3.0339) Thus both criterion and predictor variables, within the time frame covered by the study, can be considered as comprising of the life experiences and observations of the respondents included in the study.

Result For Tests For Hypotheses: The result for the tests on the hypotheses is presented in this section. The relationship between the variables was ascertained in this section using the Spearman’s rank order correlation coefficient. Presented in table 2 is the result for the tests on the hypotheses of the study.

**Table 2: Result for tests on hypotheses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Patriarchy</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.445**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.208**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patriarchy</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**

**H₁:** The more patriarchy (male dominance), the more intimate partner violence
Data indicates that patriarchy (male dominance) contributes significantly to intimate partner violence. The results ($\rho = .445$ and $P = .000$) affirm the alternative hypothesis which states that: the more patriarchy (male dominance), the more intimate partner violence, therefore the hypothesis is accepted.

Figure 4: Scatterplot for relationship between patriarchy and IPV

The relationship between patriarchy and intimate partner violence as depicted in Figure 4 further reiterated the earlier tests for significance of relationship (table 2). Data indicates 37% significant variations and changes in intimate partner violence as being linked to practices or manifestations of patriarchy (male dominance).

$H_2$: The lower the education in men, the higher intimate partner violence
Data indicates that low level of education in men contributes significantly to intimate partner violence. The results ($\rho = .500$ and $P = .000$) affirmed the alternative hypothesis which states that: The lower the education in men, the higher intimate partner violence, therefore the hypothesis was accepted.
Figure 5: Scatterplot for relationship between level of education in men and intimate partner violence

The data (figure 5) shows the scatter diagram which illustrates the relationship between low education in men and intimate partner violence. The results indicated substantial variations in intimate partner violence as a result of the manifestations of low levels of education in men. The analysis provided further evidence for estimating the influence of low education in men on occasions of intimate partner violence. This is as the $R^2$ coefficient indicated that 25% changes in events translated as intimate partner violence can be linked to manifestations of low education in men.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

The relationship between patriarchy (male child preference) and intimate partner violence in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria was investigated in the study. The study using both descriptive and inferential statistical methods analysed the distribution and relationship between the study variables within an identified population context. The findings of the analysis revealed that patriarchy (male child preference) is significantly associated with intimate partner violence. This is as the tests for the hypothetical statements show evidence of significant relations in both hypothetical instances.

The findings of this study reiterate the positions of previous scholars like Buiten and Naidoo, 2016, Whitaker and Lutzker, 2009 who assert that cultures which promote and emphasize patriarchy are most often riddled with high occasions of intimate partner violence and abuse against partners comprising of rape and assault. The study showed that factors such as male child preference and the low level of education in the male population contribute significantly to the incidences of violence and abuse against intimate partners. The implications of these findings are that within cultural and socio-contextual systems with high tolerance for male dominance lie the root cause for the incessancy of intimate partner violence. Such societal values and norms expressed through tendencies to subjugate the female gender and voice as being inferior to that of
the male, invariably promotes oppression, exploitation and abuse of the female within those social contexts and cultural systems. It is, therefore, concluded from this study that patriarchy and the emphasis on male (fathers, husbands, brothers, sons) over female (Mothers, wives, sisters, daughters) contributes to intimate partner violence in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria.
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