Intimate partners' violence and birth spacing in Nigeria- implications for high fertility

¹SHITTU, Sarafa Babatunde ¹Babalola, Blessing

¹Department of Demography and Social Statistics, Federal University, Oye Ekiti, Ekiti State. sarafa.shittu@fuoye.edu.ng, shittlebabatunde@yahoo.com

blessing.babalola@fuoye.edu.ng

Abstract

Past researchers have indicated that intimate partners' violence is on the increase which was revealed to be associated with victim's reproductive and health life. In addition, the population of Nigerian population is high with over 177 million people (PRB, 2014)) Consequently, this study was done using the NDHS(2013) to investigate the influence of socio-demographic factors and intimate partners' violence on birth spacing in Nigeria at bivariate, univariate and multivariate level (binary logistic regression). The study revealed that intimate partners' violence significantly influenced child spacing in Nigeria after controlling for confounding variables. The current age of mothers, religion, region, wealth index significantly influenced birth spacing in Nigeria at p-value < 0.05. The study therefore recommends that policy and programs should address the significant factors that influence birth spacing in order to achieve that aim of reducing fertility and improved maternal health in Nigeria.

Keywords: Child Spacing, Violence

Introduction

Over the years, there have been several reports of sexual abuse and other forms of violence and it is one of the most serious global and systemic forms of human rights violations that exist till date. The most common type of violence directed against women is actually carried out by their partners. This violence can either lead to unintended pregnancies and associated pregnancy outcomes.

Intimate partners' violence is any act against a person's sexuality or rights using force, intimidation or any other means by any person closely related to the victim, in any place, including home and work place. It also the violence can be in form sexual, physical and emotional violence which have been reported having reproductive and health outcomes.

Despite special interventions in Nigeria on curbing intimate partners' violence and its implications by increasing campaigns against sexual violence and also "war declaration against the acts", It is still reported having high incidences of intimate partners' violence in the country. The effects of sexual and other form of violence on birth intervals which eventually influence fertility behaviour of women's health and well-being are not conclusive and cannot be over emphasized. According to the latest Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey (2013), The TFR among women in Nigeria is twice the replacement level. Also there exists a variation in Total fertility rates of regions across the country. By implications, the total fertility rate in the country is still high consequent to high fertility rates in some regions of the country which are associated with cultural diversities which has influence on fertility behavior of individuals.

Several factors have been documented responsible for violence among women by their partners, for example, there is a complex interconnection between poverty and sexual violence. This is particularly important for understanding maltreatment in the lives of African women. Women of low income status, educational status,

low autonomy is vulnerable to assault by her partners. However, the influence on birth spacing especially across the regions in the country has not been well researched hence, this study. **Methodology**

The study utilized secondary data from the 2013 Nigerian Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS). The NDHS is a nationally representative stratified, self-weighting probability sample of women aged 15 - 49 years. A total of 38,948 women aged 15 - 49 were considered in this survey. The main dependent variable in the study is birth spacing which was dichotomized into less than two years and greater or equal to 2 years while the independent variable is the intimate partners violence (sexual, emotional and physical).

Using STATA package, descriptive statistics, chi-square and binary logistic regression were used in summarizing the body of data and establishing the relationship between intimate partners' violence and birth spacing of the target population.

Table 1. Mean with Standardcharacteristics	Deviation (SD) and weight	ed percentage distribution	of women by their background
Characteristics	Sample of w		Mean+SD
Characteristics	No.	%	wean±5D

Results and Discussion

Current Age (years)				
15 – 19	7,905	20.08	28.8±9.6	
20 - 24	6,714	17.35		
25 – 29	7,037	18.34		
30 - 34	5,373	14.04		
35 – 39	4,701	12.11		
40 - 45	3,663	9.29		
45+	3,555	8.79		
Religion	0,000	0177		
Christian	19,838	47.07		
Islam	18,578	52.00		
Traditional	352	0.93		
Place of Residence	352	0.95		
Urban	15,545	42.14		
Rural	23,403	57.86		
Region	23,403	57.00		
North Central	6,251	14.31		
North East	6,630	14.31		
North West	9,673	30.49		
South East	9,075 4,462	11.49		
South East	4,402 6,058	12.69		
South South	5,874	16.21		
Wealth Index	3,874	10.21		
Poor	14,117	37.38		
Middle	8,001	19.22		
Rich	16,830	43.40		
NICII	10,850	43.40		
Portners Occuration				
	265	1.16		
Not working	365	1.16		
Partners Occupation Not working Non-Agriculture	18,029	62.83		
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture	18,029 10,545	62.83 36.01		
Not working	18,029	62.83		
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total	18,029 10,545 38,948	62.83 36.01 100	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of	18,029 10,545 38,948	62.83 36.01 100 and independent	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent	62.83 36.01 100 and independent	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No.	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women %	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No.	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women %	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence	18,029 10,545 38,948 <u>f indicators of dependent</u> Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No Yes	18,029 10,545 38,948 <u>f indicators of dependent</u> Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No Yes Sexual Violence	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879 3,385	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37 14.63	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No Yes Sexual Violence No	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879 3,385 21,070	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37 14.63 95.44	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No Yes Sexual Violence No Yes	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879 3,385	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37 14.63	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total Table 2. Percentage distribution of Variables Intimate Partners Violence No Yes Emotional Violence No Yes Physical Violence No Yes Sexual Violence No Yes Birth Spacing	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879 3,385 21,070 1,190	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37 14.63 95.44 4.56	variables.	
Not working Non-Agriculture Agriculture Total	18,029 10,545 38,948 f indicators of dependent Sample of No. 16,488 5,765 17,799 4,477 18,879 3,385 21,070	62.83 36.01 100 and independent women % 75.39 24.61 80.97 19.03 85.37 14.63 95.44	variables.	

Results and Discussion

Table 1 and 2 revealed the percentage distribution of the study variables. It was revealed that women age 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45+ were 20.08%, 17.35%, 18.34%, 14.04%, 12.11%, 9.29% and 8.79% respectively. Christian, Islam, and traditional women were 47.07%, 52% and 0.93% respectively. Urban and rural women were 42.14% and 57.86% respectively. North central, North East, North West, South-East, South South and South West women were 14.31%, 14.80%, 30.49%, 11.49%, 12.69% and 16.21% respectively. Women in poor, middle and rich wealth index were 37.38%, 19.22% and 43.40% respectively. Partners not working, engaging in non-agriculture, and engaging in agriculture work were 1.16%, 62.83% and 36.01% respectively. In table 2, the percentage distribution of indicators of intimate partner violence and the frequency distribution of the dependent variables were revealed. Victims of IPV were (24.61%) and those who were not victims of IPV were 75.39%. Victims of emotional violence were 19.03% and those not victims of emotional violence were 80.97%; victims of physical violence were 14.63% and the non-victims of physical violence were 85.37%, victims of sexual violence were 4.56% and non-victims of sexual violence were 95.44%. Women who engage in at years birth spacing were 51.9% and those engage in birth spacing less than 2 years were 48.1%.

Table 3. Bivariate distribution of women's	background	characteristics and Birth space	ing.
	Birth s	pacing	
Characteristics	<2 vears	>=2 years P - value	Chi-square
		Z years I - value	

15 – 19	41.29	58.71	0.000	
20 - 24	37.34	62.66		chi2(6) = 950.6051
25 – 29	41.81	58.19		
30 - 34	46.56	53.44		
35 – 39	59.65	40.35		
40 - 45	70.86	29.14		
45+	80.51	19.49		
Religion				
Christian	43.90	56.10	0.000	
Islam	48.82	51.18		chi2(2) = 45.8375
Traditional	47.88	52.12		· ·
Place of Residence				
Urban	46.24	53.76	0.255	
Rural	47.09	52.91		chi2(1) = 1.2943
Region				
North Central	43.53	56.47	0.000	
North East	46.23	53.77		chi2(5) = 187.5945
North West	51.40	48.60		
South East	54.87	45.13		
South South	41.69	58.31		
South West	39.61	60.39		
Wealth Index				
Poor	48.17	51.83	0.001	
Middle	44.77	55.23		chi2(2) = 13.9575
Rich	46.18	53.82		
Partners Occupation				
Not working	47.89	52.11	0.531	
Non-Agriculture	48.39	51.61		chi2(2) = 1.2678
Agriculture	47.52	52.48		~ /

Maria Llas	Birth Spacing			Ch: a more
Variables	<2 years	>=2 years	P- val	Chi-square ue
Intimate Partners Violence				
No	49.84	50.16	0.000	
Yes	43.90	56.10		chi2(1) = 27.1288
Emotional Violence				
No	49.42	50.58	0.000	
Yes	44.29	55.71		chi2(1) = 20.0571
Physical Violence				
No	49.23	50.77	0.001	
Yes	38.71	61.29		chi2(1) = 11.5503
Sexual Violence				
No	47.82	52.18	0.000	
Yes	38.73	61.27		chi2(1) = 24.6425

Table 4 revealed the relationship between intimate partner violence and birth spacing. It was revealed that intimate partner violence was significantly related with birth spacing (p<0.05). Its further sub-classified intimate partner violence into emotional violence, physical violence and sexual violence. These three classification of intimate partner violence significantly influenced birth spacing in Nigeria.

	Birth Spacing				
Variables	<2 years >=2 years		P-value	Chi-square	
	L years	>=2 jeurs	1 value		
North Central					
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	46.00	54.00	0.004		
Yes	39.01	60.99		Chi2(1) = 8.1823	
North East					
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	52.48	47.52	0.000		
Yes	43.17	56.83		Chi2(1) = 18.9124	
North West				~ /	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	51.89	48.11	0.000		
Yes	44.40	55.60		Chi2(1) = 13.1694	
South East	11.10	22.00		(1) 15.1071	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	58.79	41.21	0.001		
Yes	48.79	51.21	0.001	Chi2(1) = 11.3360	
South South	10.17	51.21		$C_{112}(1) = 11.5500$	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	45.58	54.42	0.611		
Yes	44.16	55.84	0.011	Chi2(1) = 0.2592	
South West		55.04		$C_{112}(1) = 0.2372$	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	42.62	57.38	0.015		
Yes	48.68	51.32	0.015	Chi2(1) = 5.9572	
Urban	40.00	51.52		CIII2(1) = -3.7572	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	49.39	50.61	0.019		
Yes	49.39 45.75	54.25	0.019	Chi2(1) = 5.5036	
Rural	43.73	34.23		CIII2(1) = 3.3030	
Intimate Partners Violence	50.46	40.54	0.000		
No	50.46	49.54	0.000	-1:2(1) 22.9725	
Yes	43.37	56.63	C	chi2(1) = 32.8725	

Table 5 revealed the relationship between region and residence and birth spacing. It was revealed that region and residence were significantly related with birth spacing at p-value <0.05

Table 6. Binary le	ogistic regression showing the effect of IPV and Socio - demograp	hic factors on birth	spacing
	Birth spacing		
Characteristics			
	ORP> z	95% CI	

Current Age (years)	DC				
15 – 19	RC	-	-		
20 - 24	1.585078	0.000		1.41 - 1.77	
25 – 29	1.424537	0.000		1.27 - 1.58	
30 - 34	1.180551	0.005		1.05 - 1.32	
35 – 39	.6821677	0.000		.602772	
40 - 45	.4179969	0.000		.357488	
45+	.2418152	0.000		.192303	
Religion					
Christian	RC	-	-		
Islam	.835318	0.000		.761916	
Fraditional	.9870193	0.937		.712-1.36	
Place of Residence					
Urban	RC	-	-		
Rural	.9362098	0.124		.860 -1.01	
Region					
North Central	RC	-		-	
North East	.9920732	0.889		.887 - 1.10	
North West	.8794742	0.020		.789979	
South East	.6785311	0.000		.588782	
South South	1.079437	0.256		.946 - 1.23	
South West	1.13794	0.043		1.00 - 1.28	
Wealth Index					
Poor	RC	-		-	
Middle	.9982555	0.970		.912 - 1.09	
Rich	.862955	0.004		.779955	
Partners Occupation					
Not working	RC	-		-	
Non-Agriculture	1.028275	0.857		.759 - 1.39	
Agriculture	1.088873	0.586		.801 - 1.47	
Intimate Partners Violence					
No	RC	-		-	
Yes	1.149735 0.00)1		1.05 - 1.24	
Table 7. Binary logistic reg	ression showing the e	ffect of Intim	ate Partners Viole	nce on Birth Spacing	
	, contraction of the contract	Lett of mult	Birth spacing		
Characteristics			ORP> z 95%	CI	
Intimate Partners Violence No	RC		-	-	

Table 7 revealed the effect of intimate partner violence on birth spacing without adjusting for confounding variables of the study. It revealed that victims of intimate partner violence were more likely to space their birth (O.R 1.22; C.I 1.13-1.32).

Table 6 revealed the effect of the study intimate partner violence and socio-demographic factors on birth spacing in Nigeria, adjusting for confounding effect. It was revealed that current age of mothers, religion, region, and wealth index significantly influenced birth spacing in Nigeria. Women age 20-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45+ were 1.59, 1.42, 1.18 times more likely and 0.68, 0.42, 0.24 times respectively less likely to practice birth-spacing beyond two years compared to women age 15-19 years. Islamic women were 0.84 times less likely to practice birth spacing compared to Christian women. North-west, South East and South west women were 0.88, 0.68 less likely and 1.14 times more likely to practice birth spacing compared to North central women. Rich women were 0.86 times less likely to practice birth spacing compared to poor women, and women who were victims of intimate partner violence were 1.15 times more likely to practice birth spacing compared to those who are not victims.

Discussion

The study revealed that 51.9% of the respondents engage in birth spacing of a minimum of 2 years. It was revealed that current age of mothers, religion, region, wealth index and intimate partner violence significantly influenced birth spacing in Nigeria. Women in the early reproductive ages (15-34) were more likely to space birth compared to women in late reproductive ages beyond 35, when compared to women in age 15-19. Christian women practice birth spacing of two years minimum more than the Muslims. South-west women practice birth spacing more than northern women (north-central, North West) and south east women. Poor women practice birth spacing more than the rich women and victims of intimate partner violence were also more likely to practice birth spacing compared to non-victim women. These results are consistent with previous findings.

This study therefore recommends that the significant factors in this study should be addressed in programs and policies so as to increase the practice of birth spacing of a minimum of two years in Nigeria.

References

Antai DE, Antai J.(2008): Attitudes of women toward intimate partner violence: a study of rural women in Nigeria. *Rural and Remote Health* 8: 996. (Online), 2008 Available from: <u>http://www.rrh.org.au</u>

- Christina C. Pallitto &Patricia C.(2004): The Relationship Between Intimate Partner Violence and Unintended Pregnancy: Analysis of a National Sample from Colombia. International Family Planning Perspectives, 2004, 30(4):165–173
- Elizabeth A.(2009) :Violence Against Women in Nigeria: How the Millennium Development Goals; Addresses the Challenge. <u>abamaeli@yahoo.com</u>
- Elizabeth H & Anjani C. (2010): The Long and the Short: Birth Interval Spacing among Women in the United States

- Megan H, Lucy C. Chappell, B L. Parnell, Paul T. S, & Susan B.(2014):Associations between Intimate Partner Violence and Termination of Pregnancy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. PLoS Med. 2014 Jan; 11(1): e1001581. Published online 2014 Jan 7. doi: <u>10.1371/journal.pmed.1001581</u> PMCID: PMC3883805
- Population Reference Bureau (2014): World population Data Sheet. 1875 Connecticut Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20009 USA. www.prb.org
- Van Parys et al:(2014): Prevalence and evolution of intimate partner violence before and during pregnancy: a cross-sectional study. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth 2014 14:294. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2393/14/294