



DEVELOPMENT, VALIDITY, AND RELIABILITY ANALYSES OF BELIEFS ABOUT RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SCALE AND GENDER STEREOTYPES AND BELIEFS IN NIGERIA

Sunday B. Fakunmoju^{1†} --- Funmi O. Bammeke² --- Felicia. A. D. Oyekanmi³ --- Segun Temilola⁴ --- Bukola George⁵

¹Westfield State University, Western Avenue Westfield, United States of America

^{2,3,4,5}University of Lagos Department of Sociology Lagos, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This article describes development, validity, and reliability analyses of Beliefs about Relationship Violence against Women Scale (BEREVIWOS) and Gender Stereotypes and Beliefs (GESTABE). BEREVIWOS consisted of 13 items measuring beliefs about physical violence (4 items), psychological manipulation and control (5 items), and sexual violence against women (4 items). GESTABE consisted of 16 items measuring beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women (4 items), emotional stereotypes about women (6 items), and sexual stereotypes about men (6 items). Analysis was based on a convenience sample of 210 respondents in Nigeria. Exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to determine the factor structure. Relevant scales (i.e., adversarial sexual beliefs, physical aggression, hostility, relationship victimization experience, propensity to victimize partner, and relationship distress assessment) were used to establish convergent, concurrent, and discriminant validity. Social desirability scale was used to control for common method bias using partial-correlation procedures. Cronbach's alpha indicated that the internal consistency of BEREVIWOS (.87), as well as the subscales (physical violence .79, psychological manipulation and control .82, and sexual violence .82), were acceptable. Cronbach's alpha for GESTABE (.88), as well as its subscales (sexual submissiveness of women .81, emotional stereotypes about women .90, and sexual stereotypes about men .85) were equally acceptable. Hypothetical relationships between BEREVIWOS, GESTABE, and socio-demographic variables were examined. Implications for policy, practice, and research were discussed.

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Keywords: Relationship violence, Stereotypes, Physical violence, Psychological violence, Sexual violence, gender-based violence

† Corresponding author

DOI: 10.18488/journal.1/2016.6.1/1.1.58.79

ISSN(e): 2224-4441/ISSN(p): 2226-5139

© 2016 AESS Publications. All Rights Reserved.

Contribution/ Originality

This study contributes in the existing literature psychometric properties of beliefs associated with relationship violence against women and gender stereotypes and beliefs. By demonstrating hypothetical relationships between psychological variables and the scales in a developing society, the study advances knowledge about gender-based violence beyond data primarily derived from developed societies.

1. INTRODUCTION

Relationship violence remains a pandemic problem with physical and health consequences for victims, especially women (Ellsberg *et al.*, 2008). In Nigeria, for example, it is a major public health problem for women, with a prevalence rate as high as 47.3% for physical violence and 12.7% for sexual violence (Alo *et al.*, 2012). Although global attention to relationship violence has been increasing over the past few decades, little is known about the full range of beliefs associated with violence against women. Gender stereotypes and views that are integral part of beliefs contributing to relationship violence in patriarchal societies (i.e., societies in which power and control of social and economic resources are centered on men and where traditional roles and expectations of women in relationship, family, and society are framed to be inferior to men) are equally not fully examined. Because beliefs and stereotypes are crucial to understanding victimization and perpetration of partner violence, examining their dimensions will provide insight on appropriate interventions for victims and perpetrators. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to measure and describe development of beliefs about relationship violence against women scale (BEREVIWOS), gender stereotypes and beliefs (GESTABE), and to examine hypothetical relationships among them in Nigeria.

1.2. Rationale for BEREVIWOS and GESTABE

Many instruments have been developed to measure relationship violence, although most are focused on physical violence and few on sexual or psychological violence. For example, Strauchler *et al.* (2004) conducted a comprehensive review of 21 measures of partner violence and concluded that “results of this factor analysis suggest that greater emphasis must be put on factors other than physical violence in the construction of future domestic violence scales” (p. 339). Notably, their review found that limited emphasis was placed on psychological aspects of partner violence such as humiliation, psychological manipulation, and control (Strauchler *et al.*, 2004). Similarly, Schwartz *et al.* (2012) concluded from a comprehensive review of existing measures that none was based “on extant theory of how male socialization specifically contributes to dating violence” (p. 1962).

Basile *et al.* (2007) compiled a list of over 68 measures of partner violence and Flood (2008) a list of over 90 measures of violence against women. A review of these measures suggests that majority was developed in developed societies, especially the United States. With the exception of some recent measures, for example, Dating Attitudes Inventory (Schwartz *et al.*, 2012) and Rape Attitudes and Beliefs Scale (Burgess, 2007) most scales focused on victimization and perpetration and less on beliefs associated with violence against women. Socialized beliefs and stereotypes in many patriarchal societies were particularly missing or uncovered in many scales. The current

study was therefore designed to address these limitations. Undoubtedly, patriarchal societies in developing countries have made little progress in instrument development, as there are more theoretical discourses and prevalence data than empirical studies on gender-based violence. Because violence against women is particularly problematic in patriarchal societies (Population Council, 2008) identifying associated culturally relevant beliefs and transforming them into measures may facilitate a uniform frame of reference for understanding partner violence, advance theories for describing relationship violence, and provide empirical basis for comparisons across societies. In general, examining BEREVIWOS and GESTABE in Nigeria was necessary for several reasons. First, violence against women is prevalent in Nigeria. Despite the global decline in attitudes toward violence against women (Pierotti, 2013) recent report indicates that four out of five wives suffered physical or verbal abuse from their husbands in Nigeria (Kigotho, 2013). Second, existing knowledge about violence against women in Nigeria merely describes prevalence data without adequate knowledge about cultural beliefs and stereotypes instrumental to the prevalence. Third, violence against women is so pervasive that women too are noted for endorsing violence against women (García-Moreno *et al.*, 2005; Oyediran and Isiugo-Abanihe, 2005). By virtue of its large population and diverse socio-cultural compositions, empirical knowledge about socialized beliefs and stereotypes in Nigeria may provide considerable insight on possible mechanisms for their alteration.

1.3. Gender-Based Relationship Violence and Gender Stereotypes and Beliefs

Although a recent systematic review of 134 prevalence studies worldwide on domestic violence against women suggests that most studies were conducted in North America (40.5%), followed by Europe (19.6%) (Alhabib *et al.*, 2010) women are generally believed to be vulnerable to partner violence in many developing societies, even as tolerance for gender-based violence transcends gender differences (Fikree *et al.*, 2005; Oyediran and Isiugo-Abanihe, 2005; Antai and Antai, 2008). They bear the major brunt of partner violence in many patriarchal societies, where gender-based violence remains culturally tolerated, continues to be perceived as a family matter, and thrives by the mere fact that women are economically dependent on men, physically incapable of confronting their abusers, and are subject to a criminal justice system that is ill equipped to protect them from abuse and abusers. Having different experiences and being differentially susceptible to relationship violence, men and women differ in their perceptions of abusive behaviors, even as they attribute blame for relationship violence to different factors, including situation, society, perpetrator, or victims (Bryant and Spencer, 2003; Meyer *et al.*, 2010). However, unlike egalitarian societies (i.e., societies in which gender equality prevails, where men and women have equal access to social, economic, and political resources and power), blame for gender-based violence is generally attributed to power differences between men and women in societies guided by patriarchal ideologies. For example, “traditional gender norms,” “male prestige,” and beliefs regarding sexual submissiveness of women have been assigned as causes of violence against women (Laisser *et al.*, 2011; Mudiare, 2013). Similarly, “lack of submissiveness (73.1%) and refusal of sex (58%)” were the first and second major reasons husbands beat their wives (Mudiare, 2013).

Undoubtedly, relationship violence remains a major barrier to quality of life for women to the extent that some women eventually assimilate oppressive values of violence against women (Antai and Antai, 2008). Although psychological assimilation of gender-based violence by women may be deemed a vestige of patriarchal system, it demonstrates the incapacitating effects of patriarchy such that subjugated women unwillingly submit to fate in the guise of tolerating partner violence. Nevertheless, enduring psychological embrace of violence by women is incomparable to a vicious cycle of oppressive stereotypical views and beliefs reinforced by patriarchal expectations of women in family and relationships. For example, some frequently endorsed stereotypes and myths encourage exoneration of men from culpability for rape and permit attribution of blame to the female victims (Donovan, 2007; Boakye, 2009; McMahan, 2010; McMahan and Farmer, 2011; Tavrow *et al.*, 2013). Regrettably, structural arrangements engendered by patriarchy not only deprive women of socioeconomic opportunities but also create conditions for beliefs and stereotypes that help to sustain the power differences underlying patriarchal ideology.

To understand relationship violence against women, one must understand underlying culture-specific stereotypes and beliefs that reinforce gender-based violence. This is particularly true because of the linkage between gender-role stereotypes, for example, and perceptions of partner violence (Seelau and Seelau, 2005). Stereotypes not only have the potential to engender hatred, hostility, fear, mistrust, and abuse; they also have implications for believability of victimization experiences of women, biased perception and judgment of women's behaviors, recommendations for protective interventions, and prevention of revictimization experience. Therefore, to understand the linkage between stereotypes and gender-based violence in patriarchal societies, one must look beyond egalitarian ideologies for culture-specific stereotypes or beliefs that may be linked to relationship violence against women. The integration of such stereotypes or beliefs is crucial for advancing knowledge in ways that are generally meaningful to the experience of men and women in patriarchal societies. Without integrating the culturally relevant stereotypes or beliefs, methodologically consistent knowledge will remain elusive and continue to limit understanding of sociocultural forces that sustain subjugation of women. Regrettably, stereotypical views and beliefs about women are bound to thrive where endorsement of patriarchal ideologies limits gender-based knowledge.

1.4. Gender-Based Relationship Violence and Socio-Demographic Factors

As convenient as it may seem, the instrumental effects of patriarchy on gender-based violence should not compel one to overlook other risk factors for relationship violence. For example, psycho-emotional, situational, and psychopathological factors have been identified as risk factors for partner violence (Gordon, 2000; Straus, 2009; Hyde-Nolan and Juliao, 2011). In the same vein, physical aggression, hostility (i.e., readiness for physical aggression), childhood history of abuse, exposure to domestic violence, and history of perpetrating partner violence have been associated with relationship violence (Cowan, 2000; Gover *et al.*, 2008; White and Smith, 2009; Gallagher, 2011). Also, adversarial sexual beliefs and approval of patriarchal norms have been associated with endorsement of sexual violence and lower propensity to validate spousal abuse (Burt, 1980; Ahmad *et al.*, 2004).

Despite the realization that personal and psychopathological variables are risk factors for relationship violence, the fact remains that men and women differ in what they perceive as or attribute blame for relationship violence, even as their experience with regard to perpetration and victimization of violence varies. For example, men are more likely than women to perceive relationship violence differently, attribute blame to female victims, and tolerate violence against women (Nabor *et al.*, 2006; Nguyen *et al.*, 2013). Although these complex relationships are more fully comprehended in developed than developing societies, their relevance to BEREVIWOS and GESTABE is to be reasonably expected.

1.5. Theoretical Framework

In this study, conceptualization of BEREVIWOS and GESTABE is derived from feminist and social learning perspectives that describe the influence of patriarchal ideology and socialization process on aggressive and violent behaviors against women. At the core of the various strands of the feminist perspective is the attribution of violence against women to society's double standard of tacit acceptance of aggressive and violent behaviors by men and explicit condemnation of the same by women. In explaining domestic violence, feminist theory emphasizes gender and power inequality and focuses on societal messages that sanction men's use of violence and aggression (Pence and Paymar, 1993). As a result, aggressive and violent behaviors in intimate partner relationships are indicative of power inequity, privilege, and control (Ulrich, 2000; United Nations, 2007; Cooper *et al.*, 2013) which overwhelmingly favors men. When men are ascribed authority over women and women expect to submit to men in family and intimate relationships, women invariably become vulnerable to physical, psychological, and sexual violence, as well as sexual harassment, intimidation, and bullying for failing to conform to gender roles (Ulrich, 2000; Cooper *et al.*, 2013). Regrettably, patriarchal norms of physical, psychological, and sexual submissiveness of women to men remain risk factors for rationalization of gender-based violence but the situation is particularly reinforced by the socialization process. As indicated by social learning or social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) human behavior is learned such that men who have had violent, aggressive, and controlling behaviors modeled for them in childhood may condone and adopt the use of such behaviors in adulthood. Similarly, childhood experiences of violence at home heighten the propensity to perpetrate violence against intimate partners in adulthood (Robinson and Taylor, 1995; Cunningham *et al.*, 1998). Thus, exposure to violence has not only implications for perpetration of violence but also perceptions and beliefs about relationship violence (Gover *et al.*, 2008).

1.6. The Present Study

The present study therefore developed BEREVIWOS and GESTABE to explicate feminist and social learning perspectives. In our conceptualization of BEREVIWOS based on feminist and social learning perspectives, we focused solely on physically, psychologically, and sexually aggressive, violent, humiliating, and controlling behaviors. Similarly, in our conceptualization of GESTABE, we focused on beliefs and stereotypes associated with sexual objectification and emotional degradation of women, as well as sexual indiscretions and entitlement of men to

determine their possible relationships with gender-based relationship violence. Construct and concurrent validity of the scales were examined using variables generally believed to be associated with or identified as risk factors for relationship violence and stereotypes (e.g., adversarial sexual beliefs, relationship victimization experience, propensity to victimize partner, physical aggression, hostility, and relationship distress assessment).

Based on the foregoing review and theoretical framework, we examined the extent that the following hypothesized relationships can be supported or refuted in Nigeria:

Hypothesis 1: Women compared to men are less likely to endorse physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence against women;

Hypothesis 2: Men compared to women are more likely to endorse emotional stereotypes against women;

Hypothesis 3: Beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women will be related to BEREVIWOS;

Hypothesis 4: Relationship victimization experience and propensity to victimize partner will be related to BEREVIWOS; and

Hypothesis 5: Hostility and relationship distress will be related to GESTABE.

2. METHOD

A self-report method was used to collect data from respondents regarding their beliefs about relationship violence against women and gender stereotypes and beliefs. Activities preceding data collection included comprehensive review of the literature, focus groups to generate culturally relevant items, expert review of face and content validity, and pilot testing. The Institutional Review Board of Westfield State University, Massachusetts approved the study.

2.1. Item and Questionnaire Development

A comprehensive review of the literature was conducted to identify and develop a preliminary pool of items for inclusion in the scale (e.g., (Burt, 1980; Strauchler *et al.*, 2004)). Of particular relevance was the comprehensive review and compilation of measures of partner violence (Basile *et al.*, 2007; Flood, 2008). The comprehensive review identified abusive behaviors that are applicable across cultures. To identify behaviors that are peculiar to the region, three focus groups of eight participants each responded to questions that centered on general perceptions, beliefs, and stereotypes about men and women, as well as frequently recurring gender-based physically, emotionally, and sexually abusive behaviors in intimate relationships. Participants were encouraged to identify and discuss frequently recurring behaviors, beliefs, and stereotypes in intimate relationships, regardless of their personal feelings about them. Several abusive behaviors and gender-related beliefs and stereotypes were identified for inclusion in the measures.

2.2. Expert Review/Face and Content Validity

Following development of preliminary items from the comprehensive review and focus groups, the identified items were arranged under their respective categories: (a) physical violence, (b) psychological manipulation and control, (c) sexual violence, (d) sexual submissiveness of women, (e) emotional stereotypes about women, and (f) sexual stereotypes about men.

Thereafter, eight experts in Nigeria and two experts in the United States were invited to review and provide qualitative responses about appropriateness, relevance, and comprehensiveness of the items online. They were asked the following: (a) Which items do you think do not belong to their respective categories? (b) Do you think the items contain sufficient contents to cover the respective constructs? (c) Are the items culturally appropriate for Nigeria (i.e., do they cover important aspects of gender-based violence or common aspects of perceptions, stereotypes, and beliefs about men and women)? (d) What important culturally appropriate items do you think are excluded from the items? (e) What items do you recommend for exclusion and why? and (f) Are there any items regarding relationship violence in the region you can suggest for inclusion? The experts reviewed the items and provided qualitative responses online through SurveyMonkey.com™. The agreement for inclusion of items for relationship violence against women ranged from 71% to 100%, whereas the agreement for inclusion of items for GESTABE ranged from 43% to 100%. Qualitative responses centered on the need to rephrase some items and remove some items because of cultural sensitivity, as well as concerns about social desirability responses. For example, a reviewer suggested that “cultural biases and perceptions make some questions on this page to be inappropriate to the Nigerian society. Views and beliefs on some of the issues are deeply entrenched and may be difficult to assess accordingly.” However, another reviewer suggested, “It has to be noted that in spite of the existence of patriarchy, many young men from middle class families have embraced modern values of taking the women in their lives as equal partners.” As a result, some bizarre and extreme beliefs, perceptions, and stereotypes that may lack cross-validation were excluded from consideration. Following revision and integration of reviewers’ feedback, 56 items remained for data collection. Conceptual definitions and sample items of the constructs are reported in Table 1.

2.3. Pilot Test

The 56 items were pilot tested online among 33 nonstudents and students at a university in a major urban center of Nigeria. Feedback from respondents suggested that the items were comprehensible and culturally relevant to beliefs, stereotypes, and relationship violence against women in Nigeria.

Table-1. Constructs, Conceptual Definitions, and Sample Items for Beliefs About Relationship Violence Against Women and Gender Stereotypes and Beliefs

Construct	Conceptual Definition	Sample Item
Physical violence	Beliefs regarding physical or threat of physical aggression (e.g., hitting, punching, pushing, slapping etc.) that may result in pain/injury to an intimate female partner	Because the man is the head of his household, he has a right to hit his woman; a woman who disobeys her man should expect some physical roughness in return; it is possible for a man to love his woman and beat her at the same time.
Psychological manipulation and control	Beliefs regarding behaviors designed to maintain devotion and commitment of women while preserving power differences and concealing inadequacy of men in intimate relationship	A man should let his woman realize how lucky she is to have him by letting her know how much other women desperately want him; preventing a woman from having too much of everything is the best way a man can remain relevant in her life.
		<i>Continue</i>

Sexual violence	Beliefs regarding sexually coercive behaviors engendered by patriarchal norms of sexual entitlement and privileges over women, false assumptions about female sexual desires and expectations, and trivialization of men's untamable sexual desires	Although a woman may refuse the sexual demands of her man, she expects him to get it by force; when it comes to sex, some women enjoy being physically forced so that they will not be perceived as cheap, easy, or loose.
-----------------	---	--

Table-1. Continued

Construct	Conceptual Definition	Sample Item
Sexual submissiveness	Beliefs regarding male ownership of female sexuality as well as sexual accountability of women to insatiable sexual urges of men, engendered by patriarchal view of women as sexual objects of men	A woman should always meet the sexual demands of her man because her body belongs to him; a woman can never justify refusing the sexual demands of her man.
Emotional stereotype	Beliefs regarding emotional instability of women in relation to seeking and sustaining men's attention, commitment, and approval	Most women are eaten up by jealousy of their real and imagined rivals; although oil and water do not mix, women and jealousy are real friends; women are clever at using their desire for a male child as an excuse for having many children their men cannot care for.
Sexual stereotype	Beliefs regarding sexual indiscretions and unfaithfulness of men, sustained by patriarchal endowment of sexual privileges over women and lack of punitive consequences for sexual laxities of men	Although it's hard to admit it, the life of men revolves around two women: their woman and their mistresses; because men are vulnerable to sex, women should make them beg for sex than give it freely; through his ego, food, and sex, a woman should make her man the puppet he is.

Note: Sample items include items that were eliminated during exploratory factor analysis.

2.4. Scale Format: Items and Response Choices

The 56 items for analysis include 30 items for BEREVIWOS and 26 items for GESTABE. For each item, respondents were asked "To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?" Participants responded by rating each item using a Likert-type scale of *strongly disagree* = 1, *disagree* = 2, *neither disagree nor agree* = 3, *agree* = 4, and *strongly agree* = 5. Response choices were intended to capture the extent to which respondents endorsed or disapproved of the abusive and stereotypic behaviors and beliefs. Lower scores in the form of *strongly disagree* indicated greater disapproval of the behaviors and beliefs and higher scores in the form of *strongly agree* indicated greater endorsement of the behaviors and beliefs. None of the items was reverse coded. In addition to responding to questions about BEREVIWOS and GESTABE, respondents provided demographic information.

3. DATA COLLECTION

Verbal and email solicitation was used to recruit participants for the anonymous survey described as a measure of beliefs and perceptions of relationship violence. The link to the survey was shared with persons on email list of two of the investigators. Recipients were encouraged to share the link with others; a couple of recipients posted the link on their Facebook wall. Six internet café operators in Southern parts of the country were also consulted to recruit participants for the

study. Respondents completing the survey at the cafés received an equivalence of \$1.80 for their participation.

3.1. Measures

In addition to responding to the questions on the scales, participants completed some measures to examine construct (i.e., convergent and divergent) and concurrent validity. Each is described in this section.

Adversarial sexual beliefs. Adversarial sexual beliefs were operationalized with a relevant scale from Burt (1980). The scale comprises 9 items; examples include “many women are so demanding sexually that a man just can’t satisfy them; most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man; in a dating relationship a woman is largely out to take advantage of a man.” Response choices ranged from *strongly disagree* = 1 to *strongly agree* = 7. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .80 in the original study (Burt, 1980) and .90 in the current study.

Physical aggression and hostility. Physical aggression and hostility were operationalized using the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (Buss and Perry, 1992). Examples of the 9 items for physical aggression are “I have become so mad that I have broken things” and “Once in a while, I can’t control the urge to strike another person.” Examples of the 8 items for hostility are “I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things” and “I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.” Response choices ranged from *extremely uncharacteristic of me* = 1 to *extremely characteristic of me* = 5. The item “I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person” was reverse coded for physical aggression. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was .85 for physical aggression and .77 for hostility in the original study (Buss and Perry, 1992) and .70 for physical aggression and .76 for hostility in the current study.

Relationship victimization experience. Victimization experience by a partner was operationalized using HITS, a short domestic violence screening tool (Sherin *et al.*, 1998). HITS is preceded by a question (“How often does your partner . . .”) that is accompanied by four statements (i.e., “Physically hurt you, Insult or talk down to you, Threaten you with harm, Scream or curse at you”). Response choices were *Never* = 1, *Rarely* =

2, *Sometimes* = 3, *Fairly often* = 4, *Frequently* = 5. Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was above .80 in previous studies (Sherin *et al.*, 1998) and .74 in the current study.

Propensity to victimize partner. Propensity to victimize partner was operationalized by altering the preceding questions for HITS to capture the propensity of respondents to abuse a partner in an intimate relationship. Participants were asked, “How likely are you to do the following?” followed by four statements (i.e., “Physically hurt your partner, Insult or talk down to your partner, Threaten to harm your partner, Scream or curse at your partner”). Response choices were *Never likely* = 1, *Less likely* = 2, *It depends on the situation* = 3, *Most likely* = 4, *Extremely likely* = 5. Cronbach’s alpha in the current study was .86.

Relationship distress assessment. Relationship distress assessment describes some negative experience and feelings regarding violation of trust in intimate relationships. Five items were developed to capture relationship distress: “I have had a relationship ended prematurely that I didn’t expect it would end; my current or ex-partner has cheated on me that I’m aware of; when I

think about my past relationships that did not work out I get really angry; I have been lied to and deceived in my past relationships; and it hurts really bad when I think about how my current or past partner deceived me". Response choices range from *strongly disagree* = 1 to *strongly agree* = 5. Cronbach's alpha for the scale is .82.

Social desirability response. Social desirability was operationalized using Reynolds's short form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). The scale contains 13 items with response choices ranging from *always false about me* = 1 to *always true about me* = 6. Examples of questions are "I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way" and "There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone." Cronbach's alpha in the current study was .88. Overall score for each scale was summed for analysis.

3.2. Data Analysis

Before analysis, preliminary efforts were performed to ensure data integrity. The Internet Protocol address (IP address) was examined to identify possible duplication of responses and, following cross-checking, no identical responses or duplication of data was identified. Descriptive analysis was used to describe demographic characteristics of participants and compute means, standard deviations, zero-order correlations, and partial-correlations. An independent samples *t* test was used to determine demographic differences in responses to measured variables. Construct (i.e., convergent and discriminant) and concurrent validity and reliability of each dimension of BEREVIWOS and GESTABE were examined. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with varimax rotation was used to extract the factor structure of the scales. From a total 249 participants, respondents who did not complete relationship violence and stereotype questions were deleted, resulting in a sample size of 210. Ipsative mean imputation (Schafer and Graham, 2002) was used to address missing values. Data were analyzed using SPSS 20™ (IBM, 2011).

4. RESULTS

4.1. Sample Characteristics

Participants consisted of 210 adults in Nigeria. The sample was 53.3% male ($n = 112$) and 46.7% female ($n = 98$). A majority (67.6%, $n = 142$) was unmarried; most (65.2%, $n = 137$) identified their ethnic background as Yoruba. The mean age of the participants was 28.71 years ($SD = 9.63$ years). Slightly more than half (53.8%, $n = 113$) had bachelor or higher degrees, although 35% ($n = 74$) self-identified as undergraduate or graduate students. A majority (64.8%, $n = 136$) described their family economic background as either very rich (7.6%, $n = 16$), moderately rich (44.3%, $n = 93$), or neither rich nor poor (43.8%, $n = 92$).

4.2. Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary reliability analyses were conducted for the 56 items. None of the items increased the Cronbach's alpha of .944 if deleted and only two items had the lowest corrected item-total correlation ($r = .245$ and $.294$). EFA with varimax rotation was performed to identify the structure of the items (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The analysis identified 12 factors for the 56 items, which was far beyond the expected number of factors. As a result, criteria were followed to

eliminate some items and factors. Items that met the following criteria were eliminated from the 12 factors: (a) items that did not load on their respective factors, (b) items that loaded less than .30 on a factor, (c) items that loaded .30 or more on three or more factors, and (d) items that loaded at greater than .40 on more than two factors (see Matsunaga (2010)). Items were reanalyzed (EFA – Principal Factors Analysis method - with varimax rotation) using the criteria to eliminate additional items. Following the reanalyses, six factors met the criteria of eigenvalue greater than 1 and the scree plot indicated that only six factors were theoretically meaningful (see (Comrey and Lee, 1992)): three factors for BEREVIWOS (i.e., physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence) and three factors for GESTABE (i.e., emotional stereotypes about women, sexual stereotypes about men, and sexual submissiveness of women).

4.3. Identified Latent Factors

Tables 2 and 3 report means, standard deviations, corrected item-to-total correlations, Cronbach’s alpha (α), factor loadings, and communalities of the factors comprising BEREVIWOS (Table 2) and GESTABE (Table 3). Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant, χ^2 (406, $N = 210$) = 2886.73, $p < .0005$, suggesting that the correlation matrix was not an identity matrix. Results indicated that measures of sampling adequacy (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin = .84) exceeded the recommended value of .6, suggesting that the sample size was adequate for the analysis.

Table-2. Means, Standard Deviations, Corrected Item-to-Total Correlations, Factor Loadings, and Communalities of Beliefs About Relationship Violence Against Women Scale (BEREVIWOS)

	Mean	SD	CITTC [#]	Factor Loading			Comm. ^{&} (h ²)
				PMC	PV	SV	
Physical Violence (PV) (Cronbach’s alpha = .79)							
1. Because a man is the head of his household, he has a right to hit his woman.	1.47	.77	.25		.837		.684
2. It is within a man’s rights to beat his woman with any objects of his choosing.	1.43	.79	.25		.832		.655
3. It is part of our culture for a man to beat his woman.	1.62	.88	.20		.624		.455
4. A woman who provokes her man into punching her deserves the punching.	1.87	1.01	.45		.453		.425
Psychological Manipulation and Control (PMC) (Cronbach’s alpha = .82)							
5. A man should let his woman realize how lucky she is to have him by letting her know how much other women desperately want him.	2.32	1.29	.46	.797			.586
6. Sometimes a man has to let his woman know he will leave her if she doesn’t follow his instructions.	2.37	1.27	.52	.694			.558
7. A man should do everything within his power to make his woman obey him.	1.99	1.11	.36	.683			.492
8. A man should closely watch the movement of his woman to prevent her from messing around.	2.36	1.12	.45	.586			.455
9. Sometimes a man should bring his woman to her knees for her mistakes by withholding his love and affection from her.	2.47	1.23	.43	.474			.398
							<i>Continue</i>

Sexual Violence (SV) (Cronbach's alpha = .82)								
10.	Although a woman may refuse the sexual demands of her man, she expects him to get it by force.	2.01	1.05	.48			.711	.568
11.	A woman should expect her man to force her for sex because men cannot control their sexual urges sometimes.	2.22	1.18	.51			.698	.597
12.	Any woman in a committed relationship should expect her man to force her for sex.	1.90	1.01	.42			.674	.605
13.	A man has the right to force his woman for sex.	1.90	1.02	.42			.423	.474
Eigenvalue					2.16	1.90	1.28	
Percentage variance					7.44	6.56	4.40	
Cumulative percentage					46.96	53.52	63.82	

Note: Factors are grouped by conceptual relationship, not by factor number in the EFA. Factor loadings less than .40 are suppressed.

BEREVIWOS Cronbach's alpha = .87. #Corrected Item-to- total Correlation. &Communality.

Table-3. Means, Standard Deviations, Corrected Item-to-Total Correlations, Factor Loadings, and Communalities of Gender Stereotypes and Beliefs (GESTABE)

	Mean	SD	CITTC#	Factor Loading			Comm.& (h ²)	
				ESW	SSM	SSW		
Sexual Submissiveness of Women (SSW) (Cronbach's alpha = .81)								
1.	A woman should always meet the sexual demands of her man because her body belongs to him.	3.30	1.27	.50			.780	.594
2.	A woman should never refuse the sexual demands of her man.	3.31	1.21	.45			.738	.547
3.	A woman should be sexually submissive to her man.	3.36	1.37	.41			.634	.448
4.	If a woman loves a man, she would never refuse his sexual demands.	3.02	1.28	.50			.566	.496
Emotional Stereotypes About Women (ESW) (Cronbach's alpha = .90)								
5.	Women are good at expressing the opposite of what they want: They profess wanting no man but spend their waking hours on how they look to attract men.	3.27	1.23	.51	.771			.607
6.	Most women are eaten up by jealousy of their real and imagined rivals.	3.46	1.12	.48	.768			.702
7.	Although oil and water do not mix, women and jealousy are real friends.	3.50	1.22	.44	.767			.713
8.	Women enjoy giving mixed messages: They cry behind closed doors for being without a man but declare in public that they desire no relationships.	3.43	1.16	.49	.730			.594
9.	It is not an exaggeration to suggest that women are confused: They act as if they are miserable with men, yet feel insecure without them.	3.17	1.11	.53	.712			.599
10.	A lot of women are vulnerable to compliments and humor, even from men incapable of winning their affection.	3.11	1.13	.34	.624			.451

Table-3. continued

	Mean	SD	CITTC [#]	Factor Loading			Comm. ^{&} (h ²)
				ESW	SSM	SSW	
Sexual Stereotypes About Men (SSM) (Cronbach's alpha = .85)							
11. A lot of men are in denial of their insatiable sexual appetite that they keep jumping from a woman to another.	3.26	1.14	.41		.723		.540
12. A lot of men have sold their souls to sex, so bad that women are able to control and manipulate them.	3.21	1.19	.44		.719		.538
13. Men are so demanding sexually that it is impossible for any woman to please them.	2.72	1.17	.41		.708		.555
14. Let truth be told, men only want sex without commitment.	3.12	1.121	.38		.667		.481
15. A lot of men are obsessed about sex, so much that they can never be faithful to any woman.	3.02	1.34	.46		.616		.526
16. Most men talk the good talk about sex but when it comes down to it, they are weak and boring in bed.	3.10	1.10	.41		.591		.484
Eigenvalue				6.88	4.59	1.71	
Percentage variance				23.71	15.81	5.90	
Cumulative percentage				23.71	39.52	59.42	

Note: Factors are grouped by conceptual relationship, not by factor number in the EFA. Factor loadings less than .40 are suppressed.

GESTABE Cronbach's alpha = .88. [#]Corrected Item-to- total Correlation. [&]Communality

The lowest communality was .398 (item 9 = sometimes a man should bring his woman to her knees for her mistakes by withholding his love and affection from her—psychological manipulation and control, Table 2) and the highest was .713 (item 1 = although oil and water do not mix, women and jealousy are real friends—emotional stereotypes about women, Table 3), suggesting that the items shared some common variance.

The eigenvalues indicated that the six factors (Emotional stereotypes about women, 6 items [Factor 1], $\lambda = 6.88$, 23.71%; Sexual stereotypes about men [Factor 2], $\lambda = 4.59$, 15.81%; Psychological manipulation and control, 5 items [Factor 3], $\lambda = 2.16$, 7.44%; Physical violence, 4 items [Factor 4], $\lambda = 1.90$, 6.56%; Sexual submissiveness of women, 4 items [Factor 5], $\lambda = 1.71$, 5.90%; and Sexual violence, 4 items [Factor 6], $\lambda = 1.28$, 4.40%) explained 63.82% of the variance (Tables 2 and 3).

Cronbach's α indicated that the internal consistency of BEREVIWOS ($\alpha = .87$), as well as the subscales (Physical violence $\alpha = .79$, Psychological manipulation and control $\alpha = .82$, and Sexual violence $\alpha = .82$) were good.

Cronbach's α for GESTABE ($\alpha = .88$), as well as its subscales (Sexual submissiveness of women $\alpha = .81$, Emotional stereotypes about women $\alpha = .90$, and Sexual stereotypes about men $\alpha = .85$) were equally good.

4.4. Demographic Differences

An independent samples t test was conducted to determine whether BEREVIWOS and GESTABE differed by gender, marital status, educational background, and student status. Results suggest that women were less likely to endorse physical violence ($M = 1.49$, $SD = .64$), psychological manipulation and control ($M = 2.05$, $SD = .81$), and sexual violence ($M = 1.81$, $SD = .86$) than men ($M = 1.69$, $SD = .70$), $t(208) = -2.10$, $p = .037$, ($M = 2.52$, $SD = .96$), $t(208) = -3.78$, $p < .0005$, and ($M = 2.19$, $SD = .82$), $t(208) = -3.23$, $p = .001$, respectively (*hypothesis 1*).

Similarly, men ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .96$) were more likely to endorse emotional stereotypes about women than women ($M = 3.12$, $SD = .90$), $t(208) = -3.02$, $p = .003$ (*hypothesis 2*).

Results also suggested that endorsement of sexual submissiveness of women differed by marital status. Specifically, those who were single ($M = 3.39$, $SD = .93$) were more likely to endorse beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women than those who were married, separated, or widowed ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 1.16$), $t(109) = 2.81$, $p = .006$.

Similarly, beliefs about psychological manipulation and control and sexual violence differed by educational background. Those who had completed a bachelor's degree or above were less likely to endorse psychological manipulation and control ($M = 2.09$, $SD = .83$) and sexual violence ($M = 1.84$, $SD = .82$) than those who had completed less than a bachelor's degree ($M = 2.55$, $SD = .96$), $t(208) = 3.68$, $p < .0005$ and ($M = 2.21$, $SD = .86$), $t(208) = 3.16$, $p = .002$.

4.5. Zero-Order Correlations among Latent Constructs

Table 4 partly describes the conceptual relationships among constructs comprising BEREVIWOS and GESTABE. Correlations among constructs comprising BEREVIWOS and GESTABE were moderate (Cohen, 1992).

Specifically, physical violence correlated positively significantly with psychological manipulation and control ($r = .35$, $p < .01$) and sexual violence ($r = .44$, $p < .01$), and psychological manipulation and control correlated positively significantly with sexual violence ($r = .54$, $p < .01$). This suggests that as beliefs about physical violence against women increase, beliefs about psychological manipulation and control and sexual violence against women increase as well. Similarly, sexual submissiveness correlated positively significantly with emotional stereotypes about women ($r = .30$, $p < .01$) and sexual stereotypes about men ($r = .28$, $p < .01$), and emotional stereotypes about women correlated positively significantly with sexual stereotypes about men ($r = .46$, $p < .01$).

This suggests that as beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women increase, beliefs about emotional stereotypes about women and sexual stereotypes about men also tended to increase.

Table-4. Construct (Convergent and Discriminant) and Concurrent Validity of BEREVIWOS and GESTABE

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1 Physical violence	1											
2 Psychological manipulation & control	.35**	1										
3 Sexual violence	.44**	.54**	1									
4 Sexual submissiveness	.16*	.34**	.35**	1								
5 Emotional stereotypes about women	-.02	.17*	.11	.30**	1							
6 Sexual stereotypes about men	.05	.17*	.12	.28**	.46**	1						
7 Adversarial sexual beliefs	.26**	.28**	.27**	.11	.07	.04	1					
8 Physical aggression	.21**	.39**	.35**	.18*	.04	.09	.33**	1				
9 Hostility	.09	.28**	.22**	.22**	.33**	.21**	.11	.49**	1			
10 Relationship victimization experience	.33**	.29**	.31**	.22**	.11	.09	.12	.49**	.27**	1		
11 Propensity to victimize partner	.22**	.27**	.19**	.07	.00	-.03	.18*	.51**	.34**	.51**	1	
12 Relationship distress assessment	-.06	.05	.04	.19**	.37**	.35**	.09	.19**	.34**	.26**	.14*	1
Alpha	.79	.82	.82	.81	.90	.85	.90	.70	.76	.74	.80	.82
Mean	1.59	2.30	2.01	3.25	3.33	3.07	4.33	1.91	2.20	1.73	1.66	2.81
SD	.68	.92	.86	1.02	.95	.91	1.50	.59	.75	.71	.72	1.03

Note: Alpha = Internal consistency estimates. SD = Standard deviation. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

However, sexual submissiveness correlated positively significantly with BEREVIWOS constructs ($r = .16, p < .05, .34$ and $.35, p < .01$, respectively), suggesting as beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women increases, beliefs about physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence against women also tended to increase (*hypothesis 3*). Although emotional stereotypes about women and sexual stereotypes about men correlated positively significantly with psychological manipulation and control of women ($r = .17$ and $.17, p < .05$, respectively), the relationship was rather weak. Nevertheless, the correlations suggest that as endorsement of emotional stereotypes about women and sexual stereotypes about men increase, beliefs about psychological manipulation and control of women increase as well. Given the moderate correlations and lack of multicollinearity among constructs, concerns for discriminant validity are minimized or nonexistent.

4.6. Construct (i.e., Convergent and Discriminant) and Concurrent Validity

Table 4 further describes the extent to which the latent constructs were similar to related measures of the same concept (convergent validity), differentiated from related concepts or measures (discriminant validity), and able to distinguish individuals with regard to related behavior, attitudes, or beliefs (concurrent validity). Validity details of physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence are evidenced by their positive significant relationships (weak to moderate) with adversarial sexual beliefs ($r = .26, .28$, and $.27, p < .01$, respectively), physical aggression ($r = .21, .39$, and $.35, p < .01$, respectively), hostility ($r = .28, p < .01$ for psychological manipulation and control and $.22, p < .01$ for sexual violence—convergent validity; relationship victimization experience ($r = .33, .29$, and $.31, p < .01$, respectively) (*hypothesis 4*), and propensity to victimize partner ($r = .22, .27$, and $.19, p < .01$, respectively)—concurrent validity) (*hypothesis 4*). Specifically, as reports of adversarial sexual beliefs, physical aggression, relationship victimization experience, and propensity to victimize partner increase, beliefs about physical violence against women, psychological manipulation and control of women, and sexual violence against women also tended to increase. Evidence of discriminant validity was also indicated by the low correlation and nonsignificant relationships of

BEREVIWOS constructs with relationship distress assessment. That is, relationship distress (as well as emotional and sexual stereotypes) did not play any role in BEREVIWOS.

Similarly, validity details of sexual submissiveness of women, emotional stereotypes about women, and sexual stereotypes about men were evidenced by their positive significant relationships with hostility ($r = .22, .33, \text{ and } .21, p < .01$, respectively; convergent validity) (*hypothesis 5*) and relationship distress assessment ($r = .19, .37, \text{ and } .35, p < .01$, respectively; concurrent validity) (*hypothesis 5*). Specifically, as reports of hostility and relationship distress increase, beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women, emotional stereotypes about women, and sexual stereotypes about men tended to increase. Evidence of discriminant validity was also indicated by the low correlation and nonsignificant relationships of GESTABE constructs with adversarial sexual beliefs and propensity to victimize partner. That is, adversarial sexual beliefs and propensity to victimize partner were not related to GESTABE. In general, despite some weak correlations, we were particularly mindful of constructs for which relationships were moderate or close to moderate (Cohen, 1992).

4.7. Controlling for Common Method Bias: Partial-Correlation Procedures

For this self-report, cross-sectional study, we collected data on social desirability to control for common method bias. We used partial correlation procedures (Lindell and Whitney, 2001) for common method variance to address the influence of systematic bias on the interpretation of results. The significant zero-order correlations for latent constructs were compared with partial-correlation adjustments to determine whether the zero-order correlations remained significant and whether the results could be accounted for by common method variance (Lindell and Whitney, 2001).

Following partial-correlation adjustments, correlations between almost all pairs of variables remained significant after controlling for social desirability, except for the relationship between physical violence and sexual submissiveness, which changed from being positively significant ($r = .16, p < .05$) to being nonsignificant ($r = .14, p > .05$). Given such a weak relationship between variables, a minor decrease of .02 in correlations is reasonably expected to have a significant effect. Nevertheless, changes in all correlations were minor (lowest = $-.01$ and highest = $.03$), suggesting that overreporting or underreporting of BEREVIWOS and GESTABE is less of a major concern and that the variables have a relation with each other, over and above the effect of common method variance. Similarly, the continued significance of correlations between the variables, after controlling for social desirability, suggests that interpretations of findings are less likely to be confounded by common method variance.

5. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to develop an empirically valid instrument to measure BEREVIWOS and GESTABE in a patriarchal society. Through the preliminary process of establishing face, content, construct, and concurrent validity, the study provides empirical support for the psychometric properties of the developed scales. From the six-factor model generated from EFA, three factors (i.e., physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual

violence) comprise BEREVIWOS and three factors (i.e., sexual submissiveness, emotional stereotype, and sexual stereotype) comprise GESTABE. Correlations were used to examine conceptual relationships within BEREVIWOS and GESTABE constructs and findings indicated that the constructs were empirically related. Specifically, beliefs about physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence against women were moderately related to each other. Similarly, beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women, emotional stereotypes about women, and sexual stereotypes about men were moderately related to each other. Although gender-role stereotype has been related to perceptions of partner violence (Seelau and Seelau, 2005) emotional stereotypes about women and sexual stereotypes about men were unrelated to BEREVIWOS in this study. Instead, beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women were significantly related to BEREVIWOS. Specifically, as beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women increased, beliefs about physical violence, psychological manipulation and control, and sexual violence against women tended to increase.

Findings from construct and concurrent validity further suggest that BEREVIWOS and GESTABE are related to constructs deemed to be risk factors for partner violence. For example, physical and sexual aggression (White and Smith, 2009) and adversarial sexual beliefs and acceptance of rape myths (Burt, 1980) are deemed to be related, stereotypes are believed to pervade sexual violence against women and attribution of blame to rape victims (Tavrow *et al.*, 2013), and men are rated high in terms of their inability to tame sexual urges (Romagnoli *et al.*, 2011). Previous findings also suggest that gender, education, physical aggression, hostility, childhood abuse and exposure to domestic violence, and history of partner violence are risk factors for relationship violence (Burt, 1980; Cowan, 2000; Chen and White, 2004; Gover *et al.*, 2008; White and Smith, 2009; Gallagher, 2011). Preliminary findings in this study suggest that these variables are equally vital to understanding BEREVIWOS and GESTABE. Specifically, higher adversarial sexual beliefs, physical aggression, hostility, relationship victimization experience, and propensity to victimize partner were found to be related to higher BEREVIWOS. Higher hostility and relationship distress was related to higher endorsement of GESTABE. The relationships remained valid after controlling for social desirability responses, suggesting that common method variance in no way diminished their relevance. Thus, future studies in the region will benefit from integrating the variables to determine their influence on beliefs about gender-based violence and stereotypes.

Despite psychological assimilation of violence against women by women (Antai and Antai, 2008) and gender symmetry in partner violence (Kimmel, 2002; Straus, 2009) BEREVIWOS and GESTABE differed across demographic characteristics. Specifically, women were less likely to endorse BEREVIWOS but men were more likely than women to endorse emotional stereotypes about women. This is consistent with previous findings regarding gender differences in perception and attribution of blame for partner violence (Nabor *et al.*, 2006; Nguyen *et al.*, 2013). Similarly, those who were single were more likely to endorse beliefs about sexual submissiveness of women than those who were married, separated, or widowed. Also, those who had a bachelor's degree and higher were less likely to endorse psychological manipulation and control and sexual violence against women than those who had less than a bachelor's degree.

Altogether, findings suggest that feminist and social learning perspectives are relevant to understanding BEREVIWOS and GESTABE in the region. By highlighting gender differences in beliefs, BEREVIWOS and GESTABE enable one to understand the effects of personal and psychological variables on beliefs about gender-based violence and stereotypes.

5.1. Strengths and Limitations

This study has both strengths and limitations. The strength relates to its being the first known measure of beliefs about relationship violence against women and gender stereotypes and beliefs in Nigeria, thereby providing the initial step toward understanding beliefs and stereotypes about gender-based violence in the region. It is also the first known study to validate hypothetical relationships between beliefs about relationship violence against women, gender stereotypes and beliefs, and socio-demographic variables in the region. By collecting data online, the study reached a wider geographical coverage than would have been possible via a survey administered in print. Therefore, the potential impact of knowledge generated from the scales on policy, practice, and research on gender-based violence is broadened.

Despite the above strength, this study has some limitations, specifically related to collecting data online. Although collecting data online minimizes data handling errors (e.g., data entry), it is possible that respondents who have access to the Internet may differ in significant ways from those who have no access to the Internet. Similarly, BEREVIWOS and GESTABE about respondents in rural areas without access to the Internet may differ in significant ways from respondents in this study, who were predominantly residents in urban or semi-urban areas. For example, recent finding suggests that abuse experience by women differs by marital status, geographical location, or urban status (Rennison *et al.*, 2013). BEREVIWOS also may differ among respondents from different religious backgrounds, especially given that patriarchy and religion are interwoven. As a result, future studies may consider geographical location (i.e., rural vs. urban centers) and religious factors in examining possible differences in beliefs about gender-based relationship violence and stereotypes.

5.2. Implications for Policy, Practice, and Research

Understanding beliefs about gender-based violence and stereotypes in patriarchal societies is vital in many ways, because beliefs are often precursors for actions in relationship violence. The scales may be useful for understanding patriarchal views about women, which are crucial for identifying susceptibility for victimization and potentials for perpetration of partner violence. When compared with relevant factors (e.g., childhood abuse or history of domestic violence) or constructs (e.g., anger, psychological distress), they may provide valuable information for policy and practice intervention (e.g., education and awareness campaign) for perpetrators and victims of relationship violence in the region. The scales also have the potential to generate methodological consistencies in research and enhance generation of comparative knowledge about violence against women across regions.

6. CONCLUSION

Generating culturally relevant items to measure beliefs about relationship violence against women and gender stereotypes and beliefs may serve as a good first step in stimulating methodologically consistent research on gender-based violence and stereotypes in the region. Future studies will provide further evidence of validity and reliability in establishing the relevance of the scales to measure empirical relationships among variables related to relationship violence and gender stereotypes.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, F., S. Riaz, P. Barata and D.E. Stewart, 2004. Patriarchal beliefs and perceptions of abuse among South Asian immigrant women. *Violence against women*, 10(3): 262-282. DOI 10.1177/1077801203256000.
- Alhabib, S., U. Nur and R. Jones, 2010. Domestic violence against women: Systematic review of prevalence studies. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(4): 369-382. DOI 1007/s10896-009-9298-4.
- Alo, O.A., E.K. Odusina and G. Babatunde, 2012. Spousal violence in Southwest Nigeria: Prevalence and correlates. *Journal of Women's Health Care*, 1(2): 1-8. DOI org/10.4172/2167-0420.1000110.
- Antai, D.E. and J.B. Antai, 2008. Attitudes of women toward intimate partner violence: A study of rural women in Nigeria. *Rural and Remote Health*, 8(3): 1-12.
- Bandura, A., 1986. *Social foundations of thoughts and actions: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Basile, K.C., M.F. Hertz and S.E. Back, 2007. *Intimate partner violence and sexual violence victimization assessment instruments for use in healthcare settings: Version 1*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.
- Boakye, K.E., 2009. Attitudes toward rape and victims of rape: A test of the feminist theory in Ghana. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10): 1633-1651. DOI 10.1177/0886260509331493.
- Bryant, S.A. and Spencer, 2003. University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(6): 369-376.
- Burgess, G.H., 2007. Assessment of rape-supportive attitudes and beliefs in college men: Development, reliability, and validity of the rape attitudes and beliefs scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(8): 973-993. DOI 10.1177/0886260507302993.
- Burt, M.R., 1980. Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2): 217-230.
- Buss, A.H. and M. Perry, 1992. The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3): 452-459.
- Chen, P. and H.R. White, 2004. Gender differences in adolescent and young adult predictors of later intimate partner violence: A prospective study. *Violence against women*. 10(11): 1283-1301. DOI 10.1177/1077801204269000.
- Cohen, J., 1992. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1): 155-159. DOI 10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155.
- Comrey, A.L. and H.B. Lee, 1992. *A first course in factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Cooper, L., E. Paluck and E. Fletcher, 2013. Reducing gender-based violence. In M. Ryan & N. Branscombe (Eds). The Sage handbook of gender and psychology. London, UK: Sage. pp: 359-378. Doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446269930.n22>.
- Cowan, G., 2000. Women's hostility toward women and rape and sexual harassment myths. *Violence Against Women*, 6(3): 238-246. DOI 10.1177/10778010022181822.
- Cunningham, A., P.G. Jaffe, L. Baker, T. Dick, S. Malla, N. Mazaheri and S. Poisson, 1998. Theory-derived explanations of male violence against female partners: Literature update and related implications for treatment and evaluation. London, UK: London Family Court Clinic.
- Donovan, R.A., 2007. To blame or not to blame: Influences of target race and observer sex on rape blame attribution. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(6): 722-736.
- Ellsberg, M., H.A. Jansen, L. Heise, C.H. Watts and C. Garcia-Moreno, 2008. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: An observational study. *Lancet*, 371(9619): 1165-1172.
- Fikree, F.F., J.A. Razzak and J. Durocher, 2005. Attitudes of Pakistani men to domestic violence: A study from Karachi, Pakistan. *Journal of Men's Health and Gender*, 2(1): 49-58.
- Flood, M., 2008. Measures for the assessment of dimensions of violence against women: A compendium. Available from <http://www.svri.org/measures.pdf>.
- Gallagher, K.E., 2011. What accounts for men's hostile attitudes toward women? The influence of hegemonic male role norms and masculine gender role stress. *Violence Against Women*, 17(5): 568-583. DOI 10.1177/1077801211407296.
- García-Moreno, C., H.A.F.M. Jansen, M. Ellsberg, L. Heise and C. Watts, 2005. WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. Available from http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/.
- Gordon, M., 2000. Definitional issues in violence against women: Surveillance and research from a violence research perspective. *Violence Against Women*, 6(7): 747-783. DOI 10.1177/1077801200006007004.
- Gover, A.R., C. Kaukinen and K.A. Fox, 2008. The relationship between violence in the family of origin and dating violence among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(12): 1667-1693. DOI 10.1177/0886260508314330.
- Hyde-Nolan, M.E. and T. Juliao, 2011. Theoretical basis for family violence. In R. Fife & S. Schrage (Eds). *Family violence: What health care providers need to know*. 1st Edn., Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning. pp: 5-21.
- IBM, C., 2011. IBM SPSS statistics for windows, version 20.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp. Kigotho, W., May 2013. Why fewer men are beating their wives. Available from <http://www.standardmedia.co.ke/lifestyle/article/2000084585/decline-in-wife-battery>.
- Kigotho, W., 2013. Why fewer men are beating their wives. Available from <http://www.standardmedia.co.ke/lifestyle/article/2000084585/decline-in-wife-battery>.
- Kimmel, M.S., 2002. Gender symmetry in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11): 1332-1363.

- Laisser, R.M., L. Nystrom, H. Lugina and M. Emmelin, 2011. Community perceptions of intimate partner violence: A qualitative study from urban Tanzania. *BMC Women's Health*, 11(13): 1-12.
- Lindell, M.K. and D.J. Whitney, 2001. Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1): 114-121.
- Matsunaga, M., 2010. How to factor-analyze your data right: Do's, don'ts, and how-to's. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 3(1): 97-110.
- McMahon, S., 2010. Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 59(1): 3-11.
- McMahon, S. and G. Farmer, 2011. An updated measure for assessing subtle rape myths. *Social Work Research*, 35(2): 71-81. DOI 10.1093/swr/35.2.71.
- Meyer, A., B. Wagner and M.A. Dutton, 2010. The relationship between battered women's causal attributions for violence and coping efforts. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(5): 900-918. DOI 10.1177/0886260509336965.
- Mudiare, P.E.U., 2013. The perception of gender roles and its implication for spousal violence in Kaduna metropolis. Kaduna State, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(23): 239-258.
- Nabor, E.L., T.L. Dietz and J.L. Jasinski, 2006. Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. *Violence and Victims*, 21(6): 779-795.
- Nguyen, T.T., Y. Morinaga, I.H. Frieze, J. Cheng, M. Li, A. Doi and C. Li, 2013. College students' perceptions of intimate partner violence: A comparative study of Japan, China, and the United States. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 7(2): 261-273.
- Oyediran, K.A. and U.C. Isiugo-Abanihe, 2005. Perceptions of Nigerian women on domestic violence: Evidence from 2003 Nigeria demographic and health survey. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*, 9(2): 38-53.
- Pence, E. and M. Paymar, 1993. *Education groups for men who batter*. London, UK: Springer.
- Pierotti, R.S., 2013. Increasing rejection of intimate partner violence: Evidence of global cultural diffusion. *American Sociological Review*, 78(2): 240-265. DOI 10.1177/0003122413480363.
- Population Council, 2008. *Sexual and gender based violence in Africa*. Available from http://www.popcouncil.org/pdfs/AfricaSGBV_LitReview.pdf.
- Rennison, C.M., W.S. DeKeseredy and M. Dragiewicz, 2013. Intimate relationship status variations in violence against women: Urban, suburban, and rural differences. *Violence Against Women*, 19(11): 1-19. DOI 10.1177/1077801213514487.
- Reynolds, W.M., 1982. Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-crowne social desirability scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 38(1): 119-125. DOI 10.1002/1097-4679(198201).
- Robinson, D. and J. Taylor, 1995. *The incidence of family violence perpetrated by federal offenders: A file review study*. Ottawa, Canada: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Romagnoli, M., E. Sukaj and S. Carboni, 2011. *Attitudes on gender stereotypes and gender-based violence among youth*. Available from <http://www.medinstgenderstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/Research-Report-Italy.pdf>.
- Schafer, J.L. and J.W. Graham, 2002. Missing data: Our view of the state of the art. *Psychological Methods*, 7(2): 147-177. DOI 10.1037//1082-989X.7.2.147.

- Schwartz, J.P., F.A. Kelley and N. Kohli, 2012. The development and initial validation of the dating attitudes inventory: A measure of the gender context of dating violence in men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(10): 1959–1986. DOI 10.1177/0886260511431432.
- Seelau, S.M. and E.P. Seelau, 2005. Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6): 363-371. DOI 10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4.
- Sherin, K.M., J.M. Sinacore, X.Q. Li, R.E. Zitter and A. Shakil, 1998. HITS: A short domestic violence screening tool for use in a family practice setting. *Family Medicine*, 30(7): 508-512.
- Strauchler, O., K. McCloskey, K. Malloy, M. Sitaker, N. Grigestabey and P. Gillig, 2004. Humiliation, manipulation, and control: Evidence of centrality in domestic violence against an adult partner. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(6): 339-354. DOI 10.1007/s10896-004-0679-4.
- Straus, M.A., 2009. Why the overwhelming evidence on partner physical violence by women has not been perceived and is often denied. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*, 18(6): 552-571. DOI 10.1080/10926770905105081.
- Tabachnick, B. and L. Fidell, 2007. *Using multivariate statistics*. 5th Edn., New York: Harper Collins.
- Tavrow, P., M. Withers, A. Obbuyi, V. Omollo and E. Wu, 2013. Rape myth attitudes in rural Kenya: Toward the development of a culturally relevant attitude scale and blame index. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(10): 2156-2178. DOI 10.1177/0886260512471086.
- Ulrich, J.L., 2000. Confronting gender-based violence with international instruments: Is a solution to the pandemic within reach? *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 7(2): 629-654.
- United Nations, 2007. *Indicators to measure violence against women*. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations for the Advancement of Women.
- White, J.W. and P.H. Smith, 2009. Covariation in the use of physical and sexual intimate partner aggression among adolescent and college-age men: A longitudinal analysis. *Violence Against Women*, 15(1): 24-43. DOI 10.1177/1077801208328345.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, International Journal of Asian Social Science shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.